Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

5/2/R

The EVOLUTION of the SAMKHYA School of Thought

by DR. ANIMA SEN GUPTA M.A. Ph.D

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

an

APPRECIATION

I have known Dr. Anima Sen Gupta of Patna University for the last three years. During this period, I had the privilege of judging her merit in the subject of Indian Philosophy. I find she has full grasp of the subject of Indian Philosophy and has the ability to do any research work.

Her knowledge of Sanskrit is complete and as such any work she produces is not merely a translation but it is based on materials collected from the original sources.

Her work, "The Evolution of Samkhya School of Thought" is essentially original and I have not the least doubt that this book will be widely appreciated by students of Indian Philosophy. I am quite sure that she has enough talents to produce more original works of this type thereby serving the cause of Indian Philosophy for which she is eminently fitted.

KEDAR NATH OJHA
SENIOR PROF. OF PHILOSOPHY
GOVT. SANSKRIT COLLEGE
PATNA

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The EVOLUTION *of the* SAṂKHYA SCHOOL *of* THOUGHT

By

Dr. ANIMA SEN-GUPTA
M. A., PH. D.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

:All rights reserved by the authoress:

The Copy of the book can be had from:

(1) M. R. Sen, 65/64, Moti Mahal, Kanpur

(2) Dr. Anima Sen-Gupta, Krishnaghat Quarters,
P. O. Patna University, Patna

:Printed at the Pioneer Press Ltd., Lucknow:
:Published by the authoress : January: 1959:

PRICE Rs. 6/-

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

ABBREVIATIONS

Upa.	..	*Upaniṣad*
Kārikā	..	*Sāṃkhya-Kārikā*
Śveta	..	*Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*
Chānd.	..	*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*
Bṛhad.	..	*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*
Mait.	..	*Maitrāyani Upaniṣad*
S.-P.-B.	..	*Sāṃkhya-Pravacana-Bhāṣya*
S.-P.-S.	..	*Sāṃkhya-Pravacana-Sūtras*
M. Bh.	..	*The Mahābhārata*
Muṇd.	..	*Muṇdaka*
Taitt.	..	*Taittirīya*

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

CONTENTS

		Pages
Preface	..	1
Introduction	..	3

Chap. I: *Sāṃkhya metaphysics, as outlined in the Sāṃkhya-Kārikā, Tattva-Kaumudi and Pravacana Bhāsya*:

SECTION A.

1. Sāṃkhya-approach based on an analysis of human experience	..	15
2. The theory of the Guṇas	..	16
3. Prakṛti and the disturbance of the prakṛti-state	..	22
4. Puruṣa and its union with prakṛti	..	26

SECTION B.

5. Evolution	..	32
6. The Sāṃkhya theory of Causation	..	41

SECTION C.

7. Sāṃkhya-atheism	..	44
8. Liberation as expounded in the Philosophy of Sāṃkhya	..	48
9. Recapitulation	..	51

Chap. II: *Sāṃkhya in the Upaniṣads*:

1. Sāṃkhya in the Upaniṣads (*Introduction*)	..	53
2. Dualistic ideas in the Upaniṣads	..	53
3. The Transcendental Puruṣa	..	54
4. Reality of the Supreme Transcendental Self	..	55
5. The Objective World	..	56
6. The Concept of Self:Individual Soul and the Supreme and Transcendental Spirit.	..	57
7. Categories of the Sāṃkhya	..	59
8. Distinction between the Great Self & Buddhi	..	59
9. The Concept of Tanmātras	..	60
10. Further Evolution	..	60

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

		Pages
11.	The Theory of the Guṇas ..	62
12.	Separate Existence of the Puruṣa ..	64
13.	Elucidation of the Ideas of the Highest or Transcendental Self, the Phenomenal Self and also of the intelligisation of the Buddhi by the Consciousness of Self. ..	65
14.	The Sāṇkhya Theory of Causation. ..	66
15.	Findings in the Upaniṣads. ..	66

Chap. III: Sāṃkhya in the Mahābhārata:

1.	Sāṃkhya in the Mahābhārata: *ntroduction* ..	70

Theistic Account:

1.	Puruṣa, Prakṛti and the Puruṣottama ..	70
2.	The Kṣetra, the Kṣetrajña and their duality ..	71
3.	The Guṇas ..	74
4.	Buddhi or Intelligence-stuff ..	74
5.	The Categories ..	75
6.	Empirical Plurality & transcendental unity of the Soul ..	75
7.	The Concept of Time ..	76

Findings:

1.	Teachings of Pañcaśikha on atheistic line ..	77

Chap. IV: Sāṃkhya in the Gītā:

1.	Meaning of the word Sāṃkhya in the Gītā ..	81
2.	Puruṣottama, Prakṛti and Ātman ..	83
3.	The Kṣetra and the Kṣetrajña ..	83
4.	Kṣarapuruṣa, Akṣarapuruṣa and Puruṣottama ..	86
5.	The Entanglement of Puruṣa and the worldly life of pleasure and pains ..	87
6.	The Guṇas ..	87
7.	The Theory of Satkāryavāda ..	88
8.	Conclusion ..	88

Chap. V: Manu Smṛti & Some of the Older Purāṇas:

1.	Manu Smṛti & Some of the Older Purāṇas *Introduction:* ..	92
2.	The Viṣṇu Purāṇa ..	92

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

		Pages
3.	The Process of Creation ..	93
4.	The Kūrma Purāṇa ..	94
5.	The Mārkandeya Purāṇa ..	94
6.	Conclusion ..	95
7.	The Manu Smṛti ..	95

Chap. VI: *The Bhāgavata*:

1.	The Bhāgavata: *Introduction* ..	97
2.	Puruṣa and Prakṛti ..	97
3.	The Concept of Time ..	98
4.	Evolution of Categories ..	98
5.	Transcendental Self & Jīvas ..	99
6.	Other Schools of Sāṃkhya ..	101
7.	Kapila, the founder of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy ..	102

Chap. VII: *The Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*:

1.	The Ultimate Reality ..	103
2.	His Power and its various forms ..	103
3.	Avyakta ..	104
4.	Puruṣa and Kāla ..	105
5.	Puruṣa ..	106
6.	Time or Kāla ..	107
7.	Evolution ..	107
8.	Kapila and Ṣaṣṭitantra ..	109
9.	Conclusion ..	110

Chap. VIII: *The Caraka-Samhitā*:

SECTION A.

1.	Different senses of the term Puruṣa and the sense in which Caraka Samhitā has used it ..	112
2.	Sense organs and the acquisition of knowledge ..	112
3.	Organs of Action, Mahābhūtas & their qualities ..	113
4.	Conglomeration of Categories & the existence of the Abiding Self ..	114
5.	Elucidation of the Concept of Self ..	114
6.	The Kṣetrajña and the Kṣetra ..	115
7.	Empirical Selves and the Pure Self ..	115

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

		Pages
8.	The Category of Avyakta ..	116
9.	Caraka and Pañcaśikha ..	117
10.	The Order of Emergence of Categories from the Avyakta ..	117
11.	The State of Liberation ..	117
12.	The Guṇas and their effects on life and actions ..	118
13.	Atheism in Caraka ..	118
14.	Conclusion ..	119

SECTION B.

Buddha-Carita : .. 120

Conclusion

Section A : The three stages in the Evolution of the Sāṃkhya School of Thought .. 123

Section B : Summing up with a special reference to the Transition of the Sāṃkhya School of Thought from the Idealistic to the Realistic Position. .. 146

APPENDIX : Some important Sāṃkhya concepts and terms clarified. .. 152

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

5/2/11

PREFACE

The present work is an exposition of the evolution of the *Sāmkhya* school of thought. The Sāmkhya, one of the oldest philosophical enquiries of India, has been shaped and re-shaped in different ages. Materials available for the study of Sāmkhya are, however, scattered in various works like the *Mahābhārata*, the *Gītā*, the *Purāṇas* etc. In this work an attempt has been made for the first time to trace and connect in detail the different lines of *Sāmkhya* thought which contributed finally to the present system of *Sāmkhya* Philosophy.

The materials for the work have been gathered from the following sources (in Sanskrit) :—

"The *Sāmkhya-Kārikā* of *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*: Tattva-Kaumudī of Vācaspati Miśra: *Tattva-vaiśāradī* of Vācaspati Miśra: Tattva-samāsa: Yoga-vārttika of Vijñānabhikṣu: the Upaniṣads: the Mahābhārata (with Nilkaṇṭha's commentary): the Gītā: the Bhāgavata, the Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā: the Caraka-Samhitā: the Buddha-Carita: the Manusmṛti: the Purāṇas: the Pravacana Bhāṣya of Vijnāna Bhikṣu and the *Sāmkhya-Sūtra*.

The presentation of facts, their systematic arrangement and also the tracing out of the different evolutionary stages are the original contributions of the writer. In conducting the study, the writer has tried to give a correct exposition of the different schools on the basis of a first-hand and direct study of the sources in original, i.e. the Sanskrit.

The present work opens with an exposition of the classical *Sāmkhya*, because a clear knowledge of the classical position, at the outset, will perhaps be convenient for grasping and appreciating the different stages through which the Sāmkhya thought has passed, before attaining the classical form. The first chapter, therefore, contains a full analysis of the main stand of the classical school of *Sāmkhya*, and in some of the succeeding chapters, the different forms of the *pre-kārikā Sāmkhya* are fully discussed.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

In conclusion, two sections have been made. Section "A" deals with the three stages of Evolution of the *Sāmkhya*-school of Thought, (Starting from the *Upaniṣads* and ending with the classical *Sāmkhya*) discovered by the writer and Section "B" contains a summing up of the whole position, with a special reference to the transition of the *Sāmkhya*-school of Thought from the idealistic to the realistic stand. An appendix also is given in the end which contains clarifications of some important *Sāmkhya* concepts and terms. In transliteration, the common method of putting the diacritical marks has been adopted.

I was fortunate enough to meet the great philosopher of India, the Late Dr. S.N. Das Gupta, who a few months before his death at Lucknow gave me the necessary inspiration and encouragement to produce this work. He was kind enough to suggest the subject of my work and also a general outline. The work was carried on under the guidance and instruction of Dr. (Mrs.) Surama Das Gupta, M.A., Ph.D. of Lucknow University. I am much indebted to Mrs. Das Gupta for her whole-hearted sympathy with which she assisted me with her advice on many points of details.

I also thank Mr. M.R. Sen of Lucknow, a freelance journalist, for revising the proofs and also helping me in getting this work published.

Patna University

Anima Sen Gupta

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Introduction

If we glance through the history of philosophy of any country, we shall undoubtedly discover the truth that no system of philosophical thought can claim to be the work of one generation only. It is all the more true in regard to Indian philosophy. Most of the systems here had very early beginnings. Then, through continuous development in different ages they have been moulded repeatedly into different shapes and have become more and more determinate and coherent. The Sāmkhya-system falls under this category. It started in a scattered but conspicuous form in the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, and then through the succeeding ages, it has undergone continuous courses of development. Although the Upaniṣads are the real store-house of all the orthodox Indian systems, yet a faint awakening of philosophical quest is traceable even in the period of the Rigveda which, however, was principally an age of ceremonial and ritualistic religion.

Dawn of the Philosophic Quest:

It is of course true that most of the Rigvedic hymns were composed in praise of the various Nature-Gods like Indra, Agni etc., and that the main burden of these hymns was frank and simple solicitation for material comforts and worldly pleasures; yet, it is none the less true, that the germs of philosophic thought can be discovered, even in the salty currents of this age. Prof. S.N. Das Gupta, in his' 'INDIAN IDEALISM" has remarked: "The Rigveda and the Atharvaveda not only contain hymns in the praise of different Nature-Gods, but they also contain at least some hymns where the notion of a universal being seems to have been definitely reached." Indeed, the later hymns of the Rigveda reveal an advance of imagination and thought on the strength of which human mind seeks to go beyond the visible aspects of Nature and also makes a bold endeavour to unveil the long hidden mystery of the universe. These verses contain references of some universal being who was supposed to be the Supreme Lord of the whole creation. The Atharvaveda, too, contains hymns on Skambha and Brahma which definitely express the notion of some universal being as the presiding deity of the whole universe. Skambha is supposed to be the main stay of all worlds, the sky and the earth. He is the supreme principle to whom all gods continually pay tributes. He removes

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

darkness and pervades the whole universe. But the query, in this age, was immature like that of little children. It simply revealed the awakening of curiosity in man's mind and was not capable of leading to any deep philosophical speculations. The people of the vedic period were very energetic. They used to take pleasures in life and work. They were not at all gloomy or pessimistic. Life was a good thing to them and they were out in the world to enjoy life to the fullest extent. All sights and sounds of Nature used to create a mysterious atmosphere for them, and in this environment, they used to breathe a freshness of life which inspired them to offer prayers in solicitation and admiration of the various Nature-Gods. In the beginning they were more interested in the visible aspects of Nature, as these used to influence directly their limited pleasures and pains. Water, fire, rains, etc. were extremely important for the life and existence of these people. So, they had a very strong desire for winning the good grace of the presiding deities of these natural phenomena which were so very useful for practical purposes.

But the simple joy of life, resulting from the realisation of the limited desires and interests could not fully satisfy the blazing curiosity of man: so, gradually, the people began to free themselves from all sorts of beliefs and prejudices about the supremacy of different Nature-Gods. They then started to speculate about the origin of the world, about some supreme deity who brought this very world into being.

The famous Puruṣha-Sukta says:

"The purusha with thousand heads
With thousand eyes and thousand feet
Surrounds the earth on every side,
And goes ten digits yet beyond,
Purusha, aye, is all this world,
The world that was and that will be
He even rules the immortal world
Which must sustain itself by food.
Thus great is this his majesty
Yet even beyond in strength he goes
A quarter of Him all beings are
Three quarters are immortal beyond(1)"

(Eng. Translation, Bloom Field, Religion of the Veda)

1. The Rigveda X—90.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Again in the hymn of creation, the origin of the world is explained as the evolution of the existent from the non-existent.

> There was not the non-existent, nor the
> existent, then; there was not the air, nor
> the heaven which is beyond. What did it
> contain ? Where ? In whose protection ?
> Was there water unfathomable, profound ?
> There was not death, nor immortality then,
> There was not the beacon of night, nor of day
> That one breathed, windless, by its own
> Other than that there was not anything beyond.
> .....
> Desire in the beginning came upon that,
> That was the first seed of mind,
> Sages seeking in their hearts with wisdom
> Found out the bond of existent in the non-existent.

(*Eng. Translation Macdonell—Rigveda X*—129).

These verses reveal truly the deep philosophic urge of man which seeks to realise the oneness of the ultimate reality from which the whole world has emanated. The primordial state was completely indescribable. There was no being in the ordinary experience of senses. Nor was there non-being; for that is inconceivable. Day and Night, death and immortality and wind were of course non-existent in that stage; but there was 'that one' (*tadekam*) which existed by itself and breathed by its own inner power without the help of wind. Thus, the first cause or principle is without personality and is beyond the reach of sense-experience. But this first principle of the Rigveda was only an external creator. "On every side enveloping the earth", puruṣa transcended it by a space of ten fingers. The essentially objective outlook of the vedic thinkers could not discover the underlying unity between the Brahman (the cosmic principle) and the Ātman (individual self).

Real Philosophic Speculations in the Upaniṣads and the Identity of Brahman and Ātman:

The upaniṣadic thinkers first of all declare that Brahman is identical with the Ātman. The ultimate reality is both transcendent and immanent. The Brahman, that appears as the external world is identical with the Ātman, that resides in the heart of man.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The highest reality is not merely a cosmological God whom man has to satisfy with prayers and sacrifices: it is one with his moral nature and is revealed fully in human soul. Real philosophical speculations, therefore, had started in the Upanisadic age, when the most important question was: "What is Brahman and what is self?" The sages in this period could not remain contented merely by thinking of the divine controller as an external deity. They were very much eager to know the real nature of Brahman and so in the Upaniṣads, a history of this search is markedly visible. Brahman is not any one of the Nature-Gods, such as the sun, moon, earth, wind, fire etc. No positive content of Brahman was discovered by them. But this much was clear to them that underlying this world of change there is an unchangeable reality and that this reality is identical with the essence in man.

Two Selves:

Here, of course, we should remember that the "Ātman" in the Upaniṣads, when equated with Brahman, does not refer to the psycho-biological self. It refers, on the contrary, to pure unchanging consciousness that forms the *a priori* background of all knowledge and experience. This is the highest self and all psycho-biological selves are grounded in this highest self. The psycho-biological self is composed of sense-faculties, motor faculties, thought, will, vital powers etc., and it grows and becomes richer in empirical contents only by the action and reaction of the external world. What then, is the status of this world ?

Status of the World:

The upaniṣadic thinkers have never recognized the independent existence of the world. According to them, the world is an emanation from Brahman. But Brahman has not created the world as an external agent. The world has emanated from Brahman just as the threads emanate from the body of the spider, hairs grow out of human bodies and sparks come out of fire. Hence, the truth and reality of this world cannot be totally denied. *Annam* or matter has originated from Brahman and is, therefore, not a perfect non-entity. *Prāṇā*, *manas* and all other things and beings have sprung forth from *Annam*. But this world is real and true only in a secondary sense; its root being grounded in eternal Brahman. Hence, although worldly pleasures and worldly gains are desirable

CC0: In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

to a certain extent; yet they are not the highest metaphysical good. Desires are the springs of ordinary human action and these desires are based on ignorance or *avidyā* which makes a man unable to realise the true nature of things. The darkness of such ignorance is dispelled by the true knowledge of Ātman, and salvation, therefore, lies not in doing and enjoying worldly pleasures, but in attaining the bliss of self-realisation.

Emergence of the Sāmkhya Dualism

The upaniṣadic recognition of the truth and reality of the world at least in a secondary sense may be regarded as a ground for the emergence of a dualistic system like the philosophy of the Sāmkhya-school. *Annam* which is described as the cause of all empirical things and beings in the Mundaka Upaniṣad appears as Prakṛiti in the philosophy of the Sāmkhya system, and this doctrine of the reality of the world is further supported by aphorisms collected from the Chānd, the Svetā, the Bṛhad; and the Maitrāyani Upaniṣads. There are certain passages in the Bṛha Upanisad where the reality of the earth, water, fire, air, etc. is admitted in a sense, since all these (i.e. the world) are supposed to form the body of the Ātman.(1)

In the Chānd Upaniṣad, it has been stated that the three colours of the three elements (fire, water and earth) which are produced from the absolute, are present in all things. These, therefore, are the ultimate constituents of the world. Being produced from the absolute, they are, however, dependent on the absolute. In the 'ajā' śruti of the Śvetā. Upa. Prakṛti is admitted as the basis of the world and this Prakṛti again is identified with the māyā-śakti of God. The Maitrāyani Upa, too, recognizes the existence of Nature with three guṇas and Prakṛti is here mentioned as the mouth of the spirit which enjoys the three guṇas.

All these passages uphold clearly the view that some sort of truth and reality can reasonably be ascribed to the world. But what exactly is the status of this world is not definitely explained in the philosophy of the Upaniṣads. The implicit dualism and realism of the Upaniṣads has found more and more emphasis in the evolutionary progress of the sāmkhya system. While the Upaniṣads hold

(1) 3. 7. 3.
3. 7. 4. } Bṛha Upanishad.
3. 7. 5.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

that the world has somehow come into being, from the ultimate spiritual reality, the classical sāmkhya says that the world has sprung forth in an evolutionary series from prakṛti which is independent of the spiritual principle. This passage from the Upaniṣadic stage of monism to the stage of clear dualism of the classical sāmkhya is, however, long and varied. On ground of the evidences collected from the Gītā, the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, the Caraka-sāmhita etc., we are led to conclude that the Sāmkhya system of thought has passed through various stages of development and that it has been shaped and reshaped in different periods in the hands of both theistic and atheistic interpreters. All these stages in the evolution of the sāmkhya school of thought have been discussed in details in this work.

Cardinal Doctrine of Sāmkhya Philosophy:

The nature of Puruṣa and Prakṛti and their relationship forms the central doctrine of the Sāmkhya philosophy. The most important point in the Upaniṣadic philosophy is the doctrine that the inmost self is of the nature of pure consciousness and that it is the ground of all our experiences. The Ātman is identical with the Brahman. The diverse powers of Nature have no reality independent of it. But in the Upaniṣads, an attempt to show how from the one reality, the empirical world has sprung up is no where visible. We are simply told that this universe has originated from Brahman and that ultimately it will return to it.

The Sāmkhya-doctrine has taken up the task of explaining, how this world of multiplicity has gradually come into existence through the process of evolution from Prakṛti. In this glorious act of creation, Nature is supposed to be moved to action through the influence of spirit. True knowledge implies seeing one in many and many in one, and unless diversity is understood as well as unity, no philosophic outlook can truly be formed. Multiplicity proceeds directly from Nature and not from the spiritual principle. The spiritual reality is self or puruṣa which is of the nature of pure consciousness. Puruṣa is ever-pure in its nature and all impurities of action or passion are only falsely ascribable to it. The relation of the soul with the world is merely external and artificial. It is through ignorance and passion, gathered from the ceaseless flow of *karma* from beginningless time, that we ascribe to the soul all the impurities of our worldly life. The realisation of

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the pure nature of the self and also of its distinction from Prakṛti is the goal of this ceaseless cycle of births and rebirths.

The productive agent of the universe is Prakṛti or Nature. This agent is constituted of the three guṇas—*sattva, rajas and tamas*. The state of Prakṛti is the state of equilibrium of the three guṇas. When the equilibrium is distributed due to some sort of contact with puruṣa, the world of multiplicity comes into being. The diversity of the products is thus made explicable in the philosophy of the Sāmkhya system. There is, however, a great divergence of opinion among the different schools of the Sāmkhya, regarding the order and manner of the evolution of the mental and material world, all of which have been discussed in this work. The force that disturbs the state of Prakṛti is also explained differently by the classical Sāmkhya and the theistic sāmkhya of the pre-kārikā stage. In the pre-kārikā sāmkhya of the theistic strand, both puruṣa and Prakṛti are generally viewed either as parts or as powers of one spiritual being, and the association and dissociation between them is, sometimes, supposed to take place through the instrumentality of time which is God's transcendent power and effort. But in the classical sāmkhya, Nature is supposed to be impregnated with a sort of unconscious teleological force by virtue of which the guṇas are capable of providing the puruṣas with experience of various sorts and also of liberating them from bondage through the dissolution of *buddhi* which is the bond of the apparent union between the transcendental *puruṣa* and Prakṛti. There is no real relation between *buddhi* and *puruṣa*. But due to the presence of transcendental illusion in *buddhi* from beginningless time, the distinction between the two is not realised. This illusion is mentioned as the bondage of *Puruṣa*. The classical Sāmkhya thinks that the illusion is of the nature of non-discrimination between the *puruṣa* and the Prakṛti and that this *avidyā* is the cause of all misery. When this illusion is removed permanently, the *puruṣa* becomes free in its nature as pure consciousness and this is the state of *mokṣa* or liberation from the sorrows and sufferings of the world.

The peculiarity of all philosophical systems of India lies in the fact that they do not seek to satisfy merely the intellectual curiosity of man. Rather, they aim at enlightenment of life and thus, hope to help man in his attempt to get rid of the sufferings of the worldly existence. Hence, in India, a philosophical system is also called

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

"*Mokaṣa-śāstra* or the science of liberation. The worldly life is a life of misery and pain, desires and frustrations, and in spite of the best efforts that a man can put forth, he is unable to secure permanent happiness. A man is, therefore, required to rise above the shifting scenes of this world to attain liberation. The lust for worldly pleasures and profits can be destroyed only by divine knowledge which consists of *tattva-jñāna*. Knowledge of reality destroys the effect of *karma* and thus puts an end to the cycle of births and deaths.

The Sāmkhya says that this *tattva-jñāna* a man can attain only when he succeeds in realising the distinction between Self and not-Self or Puruṣa and Pṛakṛti. *Manas*, *buddhi* and *ahamkāra* which constitute the psychological selves and which, therefore, really undergo experiences of pleasures and pains, are not eternal. They disappear with the advancement of knowledge. What remains behind them is called in the Sāmkhya, "Prakṛti" (the mother of this universe of sufferings and pains). There is no real contact between Prakṛti and Puruṣa; Puruṣa is perfect and independent and completely aloof from everything else. A true knowledge of Puruṣa and Prakṛti will help a man to rid himself of all pains. Such a man will not be born again.

Forms and Stages of the Sāmkhya School:

The conception of dual principles, lying at the root of the world-formation, and their apparent union being the cause of all sorrows and sufferings, are the common features in all schools of the Sāmkhya-philosophy. Differences of opinion centre round the problems of the acceptance of dualism as final and ultimate and also of the recognition of God as the ultimate synthetic principle of the whole universe. Sāmkhya in the Upaniṣads, the Mahābhārata (excepting Pañcaśikha's teachings), the Gītā, Purāṇas and other vaiṣṇava literatures tend towards theism and monism. Dualism is viewed only as an intermediate step leading to final monotheism. But the account of Sāmkhya given in the Pañcaśikha's teachings as well as in the caraka-samhitā is atheistic in a clear sense. Its dualistic trait, however, remains in an implicit condition only, as Pañcaśikha and Caraka have not mentioned two distinctly independent principles like the orthodox Sāmkhya school.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Both dualism and atheism in clear and vivid forms are visible in the classical Sāmkhya, and Arāda too (in the pre-kārikā period) has preached his Sāmkhya in a similar setting. The complete passivity and disinterestedness of Puruṣa and the acceptance of "Triguṇamayee" Prakṛti as the independent cause of all inner and outer manifestations of the world are the important characteristics of the classical Sāmkhya. In the original theistic Sāmkhya, the dual principles of Puruṣa and Prakṛti are recognized, but both of them are supposed to constitute parts or powers of the Supreme Spiritual Being. Non-recognition of this ultimate uniting principle is an important feature of the classical Sāmkhya which has developed on a purely atheistic line.

The history of evolution of this school of thought, recorded here, begins with the dualistic preachings of the Upaniṣads. The Upaniṣads contain the ideas of *Prakṛti Puruṣa* and *jīva* and hold that the *guṇas* of Nature are responsible for the bondage of the individual souls, since the whole world of experience is the creation of these *guṇas*. The individual soul being bound by the *guṇas* enjoy the fruits of their various actions. In this stage of bondage, the individual self does not see the transcendental *puruṣa* dwelling within itself. A freed-soul, however, regains its pure transcendental status and is not affected by the process of transmigration. But both Nature and Jīva are modes of the supreme transcendental Spirit and are, therefore, dependent on Him. Individual souls are only the sparks of the Highest Lord and have, therefore, no existence apart from Him. This theistic Sāmkhya is further developed in the Mahābhārata and the Gīta, although in the Mahābhārata, reference of atheistic Sāmkhya is also available. Pañcaśikha's teachings represent an important exposition of that atheistic school of Sāmkhya which recognizes only 24 categories. The Gītā also upholds the doctrine of one all-inclusive God who is the possessor of cosmic matter as well as life and spirit (Parā Prakṛti and aparāprakṛti). So, the cosmic world and the world of life and spirit may be said to be existing in Him. Thus, Prakṛti in the Gītā is not a self-subsistent principle as in the dualistic Sāmkhya of the classical school. This theistic line has found more and more emphatic expressions in the Sāmkhya preachings of the *vaiṣṇava* school. Kapila, the founder of the Sāmkhya-philosophy (whose detailed reference is found in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa) gives us a

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

theistic exposition of the Sāmkhya-thought. But the Sāmkhya of the *Caraka-samhitā*, which seems to be in line with the teachings of *Pañcaśikha*, represents a form, completely different from the traditional theistic school. *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, welded together in the avyakta-category is regarded as ultimate, and there is no place for God or *Iśvara*. "Prakṛti-part" of '*Avyaktam*' is the cause of the evolution of all the categories. The self, in association with the psychical organs, appears as the knower or the enjoyer. In itself, it is perfectly characterless. Its affirmation is essential, as otherwise, we shall not be able to explain the significance of duty or of moral responsibility. Since the self is colourless, the state of liberation (the Brahman state) is also purely characterless. The classical Sāmkhya may be regarded as a further development on the Caraka-line, although it differs from Caraka-Sāmkhya in many points. The classical Sāmkhya explicitly recognizes the independent existence of the dual principles of Puruṣa and Prakṛti. Puruṣa, too, is viewed in the classical Sāmkhya as essentially conscious. Since two perfectly independent categories (Puruṣa and Prakṛti) are, here, recognized, the element of dualism is very prominent in the Sāmkhya-philosophy of the classical school. A very important affinity between the Caraka-sāmkhya and the classical Sāmkhya lies in the fact that in both God or Iśvara has not been admitted as the Highest Regulative and Synthetic principle of the universe. On ground of all these facts the writer has ventured to divide the whole course of evolution of this school of thought into three stages:—(a) The theistic and monistic stage, developed in the Upaniṣads, the Mahābhārata, the *Gītā*, the Purāṇas, the Bhāgavata and other vaiṣṇava literatures; (b) Atheistic and semi-dualistic stage represented by the teachings of Pañchaśikha (the Mahābhārata) and Caraka; (c) Atheistic and dualistic stage, represented by Arāda, Īśvarakṛṣṇa and also the author of the Sāmkhya-Sutrās. All these stages have been fully brought out and clearly discussed in Section 'A' of Conclusion. In Section 'B' of the same chapter, the writer has tried to show that this gradual development of the Sāmkhya doctrine from theism and monism to atheism and dualism, also, represents a transition of this school of thought from an idealistic to a realistic position. Attention of the reader, therefore, is particularly invited to this concluding chapter which contains an elaborate exposition of the stages of Evolution of the Sāmkhya School of Thought.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

In fine, it will not be out of place perhaps to state that Sāmkhya thoughts and ideas have influenced various forms of Hindu religion and philosophy. Indian art and literature, too, are not immune from the influence of the dual concepts of Puruṣa and Prakṛti. Kalidasa's 'Kumār Sambhava' contains an account of the theistic sāmkhya. Even in "Sahajiyā" buddhism, Prajñā and Upāya are conceived as female and male counterparts of the ultimate reality. In *Saivism*, these two aspects of reality have been conceived as Śiva and Śakti, and in the vaiṣṇava school, these two counterparts have appeared as Viṣṇu and Lakṣmi or Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. Later vedānta also displays some influence of the Sāmkhya-thoughts, as the three *guṇas* of *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas* are often mentioned in this philosophy.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

1st CHAPTER

SAMKHYA METAPHYSICS as OUTLINED in the SAMKHYA-KARIKA TATTVA-KAUMUDI and PRAVACANA-BHASYA.

SECTION A

Sāmkhya approach is based on an analysis of human experience.

The Sāmkhya-system is admitted on all hands as one of the oldest systems of thought, because the seeds from which the classical sāmkhya sprung up as a well-knit system are strewn over a vast field of philosophic writings of ancient india. The earliest available systematic exposition of the classical Sāmkhya is found in the *Sāmkhya Kārikā* of *Īśvara Kṛṣṇa*. *Tattva-Kaumudī* (a commentary on *Kārikā*) of *Vācaspati Miśra* and *Sāmkhya-Pravacana-bhāsya* of *Vijñānabhikṣu* are two well-known posterior texts on the *Sāmkhya* philosophy. An attempt has been made in this chapter to give a clear exposition of the classical *Sāmkhya* on the line of these three important *Sāmkhya* texts. Incidental references to other commentaries (such as commentaries on *Yoga-sūtra*) will also be made on relevant occasions.

Life, as all of us know is a ceaseless flow of experience. Therefore, it is expected that a good philosophy, which seeks to explain the significance of human life in relation to the whole universe, should establish its claim to general acceptance by showing that it has formulated its theory on the basis of a thorough analysis of experience.

A philosopher, who is a lover and interpreter of life, is unable to turn his eyes away from the living experiences of every moment. Our reason must fall back upon experience for collecting its own data. If reason wanders away from experiences it will create a system of dead thoughts, devoid of any touch of life and reality.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

A thorough analysis of human experience is also the starting point of the *Sāmkhya*-philosophy. The fundamental principles and categories were not merely dogmatically postulated; but they were discovered and accepted after proper analytical study of consciousness or experience. The epistemological aspect, therefore, assumes an important form in the philosophy of the *Sāmkhya*-School. *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, the *guṇas* and their conjunction and disjunction are not mythical and airy, but these are at the very root of the possibility of experience or knowledge.

Theory of the Guṇas.

The most distinguishing characteristic of the *Sāmkhya*-system is its *guṇa*-theory, which holds that all mental and material objects of this phenomenal world, are the combinations in different proportions of the three ultimate reals which are technically known as "Triguṇa". The conception of these *guṇas* arose in the minds of these philosophers, undoubtedly as a result of their analysis of our phenomenal consciousness and its objects. Each fact of experience becomes a fact of experience by virtue of its relation to consciousness. There is something special in it, i.e. some sort of intelligibility: for reason of which it easily gets related to the totality of experience of a particular person. Consciousness is revelation; and if we are to become conscious of something, then that thing must have some common characteristic by virtue of which it can be revealed as being related to the latter as its object. When "this chair" becomes an object of my consciousness or thought, it becomes so, only because it possesses within itself the capacity of becoming revealed, as soon as it comes in touch with consciousness. This capacity cannot be discovered in the so-called qualities of the chair, because the qualities can be abstracted and still the object can be conceived of as existing and getting related to consciousness without contradiction. This power, therefore, exists in the very being of the object and can very well be identified with that (being).

Each fact of experience is a being or *sattā* and this being constitutes its intelligibility. This intelligibility, therefore, is the ultimate factor in an object of experience and it is, therefore, called *sattva-guṇa* by the *Sāmkhya*-philosophers. Now, the object of experience also possesses certain characteristics like resistence, impenetrability, shape

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

and form which are, in fact, due to the presence of "massiveness" in objects. Therefore, mass or *Tamo-guṇa* is another element present in the object besides its intelligibility. The object undergoes changes. It changes from state to state as well as from form to form. There is no monotonus lingering of the same character in any object. This change or movement is due to the presence of the third principle which is called "Rajo-guna".(1) Thus, *Sattva* (intelligence-stuff) *Rajas* and *Tamas* (energy and mass) are the three *guṇas* which are responsible for all sorts of experience of a *puruṣa*. These are objective, ultimate and the irreducible elements of experience.

These *guṇas* are not the so-called qualities of the *vaiśeṣika*-system because they themselves possess the characteristics of lightness, movement and heaviness. (2) One quality cannot be thought of as possessing other qualities. These *guṇas* of course become seemingly associated with and dissociated from the *puruṣa* (3): still they cannot be regarded as qualities of the puruṣa since qualities actually and constantly inhere in the substance. So, these *guṇas* are "dravyas" or substances. All objects of this world, both mental and physical, are the results of the different permutations and combinations of these three ultimate reals. Our thoughts and ideas which seem to possess a character different from that of the physical world, are not, in fact, outside the realm of these three *guṇas*. These are as much the effects or the modifications of the ultimate reals as the so-called physical things. The only difference lies in the fact that in the mental sphere, the element of *sattva* predominates, whereas in the sphere of the physical universe, *tamo-guṇa* becomes the dominating element. *Tamo-guṇa* is present in all our ideas of objects, otherwise, these mental products could not assume the forms of their objects in order to make possible the experience of an individual. In fact, in every *cittavṛtti*, the indistinguishable union of the *guṇas* is detectable. (*Citta-vṛtti* becomes manifested, it assumes the form of its *visaya* and this needs movement.). Our phenomenal consciousness as well as its objects are due to the functioning of these three *guṇas* which are the sole productive forces of this universe.

But our experience does not possess a cognitive aspect only; it has also a feeling aspect which is more primitive and more pervasive

1. The Samkhya-Karika.....(verse 13).
2. Samkhya—Pravacana—Bhasya—Chap. (I) 61.
3. Tattva—vaisaradi—Chapt. II-18.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

than the cognitive one. Prof. S.N. Das Gupta (1) while analysing the *guṇa* concept, has shown, how feeling formulates the marginal line between thought and matter, the animate and the inanimate. From feeling complexes, we can easily descend to matter-complexes and from matter-complexes we can go up to feeling-complexes very smoothly. That is why, there is always the likelihood of mistaking a feeling-complex for a matter-complex and *vice versa*. *Samkhya* philosophy also does not recognize any rigid distinction between thought and matter. Both matter and thought are constituted of the same feeling substances which form the neutral border line between them. The *guṇas* are these feeling substances. Since the whole external world is made up of these three elements, each object of cognition possesses the capacity of producing three different feelings in the minds of human beings; i.e. pleasure, pain and delusion or indifference. So, from the point of view of knowledge, these three *guṇas* are known as *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*, but from the point of view of feeling they appear as pleasure, pain and delusion.(2) A lovely woman, for instance, excites the feeling of pleasure in the beloved person, the feeling of pain in the co-wife and the feeling of delusion in the disappointed person. This, she can do, simply because she is objectively pleasurable, painful and delusive. In other words, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* which, on the place of consciousness, appear as intelligence stuff, energy and mass and on the plane of feeling, as pleasure, pain and delusion (3) have themselves been transformed to create that lovely woman. The lovely woman is not merely the assemblage of ideas in some mind as is held by the idealistic philosophers, nor is she absolutely different from thoughts or feelings, as is ordinarily held by the realistic philosophers. Thought and thing, matter and the so-called intellectual processes do not lie in two absolutely distinct regions; and, therefore, the establishment of any kind of direct action and interaction between them (as is actually observed in our daily life) is not at all difficult. Thus, the correspondence between the inner world and the outer world has been satisfactorily explained by the *Sāmkhya*-philosophers on the hypothesis that they represent two allied lines of development from a common

1. History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. 1 page 242-243.
2. (a) Samkhya-pravacana-bhasya (Sutram--127) Chapter I.
   (b) Samkhya-karika 12.
3. The Samkhya-Karika-12.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

source, i.e. the 3 *guṇas*. These reals, thus, on their supposition, are neither mental nor physical and in this respect they remind us of the neutral entities of B. Russel. Like those neutral stuff, the *guṇas* also get arranged in different relations. When arranged in one way, they appear as mental and when arranged in a different way, they appear as physical or material.

Now, these reals are called *guṇas* because they act as ropes for binding *puruṣa* and also because they are subordinated to the *puruṣa* whose interest they serve.

They are infinite in number but they have been brought under three types in accordance with their three different characteristics(1). When we speak of *sattva guṇa* we do not mean one substance only; rather we refer to an infinite number of subtle substances possessing the common characteristics of self-shiningness and luminosity. Similar is the case with *rajas* and *tamas*.

These *guṇas*, when they act together for the production of objects, exert mutual influences upon one another, and by so doing they bring into existence new qualities and new substances. An object is called *sattvika rajas* and *tamasa* in so far as it represents the predominance of *sattva*, *rajas* or *tamo guṇa*. But even when *sattva-guṇa* predominates, *rajas* and *tamas* remain in conjunction with it, although in a subdued form. As soon as the influence of *sattva* weakens, due to some causes, the "sahakāri" *guṇas* at once become active and more prominent. In each act of production, these three *gunas* become operative, although all of them cannot maintain the same *status quo* at the same time. In revelation, it is not *sattva* alone that is active, but *sattva* as dominating *rajas* and *tamas*.

The *guṇas*, no doubt, possess different characteristics; but while they act, there is co-operation or co-mingling like that of oil, wick and flame. (2) If these three are not arranged in proper subordination and super-ordination, there will be a terrible conflict resulting in chaos and confusion. But their proper manipulation will bring about creation of new things and new varieties, just as the

1. (a) Yogavarttika-Chapt. II—18
   (b) Samkhya-pravacana-bhasya (Sutram. 127)
2. (a) Samkhyā-karika—13—Pradipavac-ca-rthato vrltih-11,
   (b) (Tattva Kaumudi, on "Karaka" 13)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

proper manipulation of wind, bile and phlegm contributes to the substance of the physical body.

When light is produced, it is produced for the enjoyment of some conscious being and not for the benefit of oil, wick and flame. Similar is the case with the conjunction of these *guṇas*. The creativity of these reals is not an end in itself; on the contrary, it serves as the only means for the attainment of *puruṣa's* end. *Bhog* (enjoyment) and *apavarga* (liberation) are the *puruṣarthas*, and the *guṇa*-stuff creates this ceaseless flow of modifications and complexities for his enjoyment and liberation. All products are therefore *upaka-ranas* for *puruṣa's* experience; but the *guṇas*, while creating the realm of experience, do not get mixed up with *puruṣa* like salt and water. Rather they serve the *bhoga* purpose of *puruṣa* by mere *sannidhi* or proximity (1). Of course, this *sannidhi* does not mean nearness in space; rather it means that *puruṣa-bodha* and *guṇa-bodha* form indistinguishable parts of the same idea, and are cognized as identical through mistake.

The *guṇas* and the *puruṣas* are thus, the main principles accepted in the philosophy of *Samkhya*. Both the categories are equally eternal, but while the puruṣas are pure and inactive principles of consciousness, the *guṇas* are the unconscious, ever changging, dynamic energy of the universe. They ceaselessly undergo changes, but changes take place in these ultimate constituents in two ways, which are known as *Svarūpa-pariṇama* and *Virūpa-pariṇam*. *Svarupa-parinama* exists in the state of equilibrium of the three *guṇas* when they exert equal influences without creating any form of commotion. In this stage *Sattva* changes into *sattva*, *rajas* into *rajas* and *tamas* into *tamas*. This state of equilibrium is absolutely indeterminate, undifferentiated and indefinite and it is called *prakṛti*. (2) *Virūpa-parinama* means the process of forming unequal aggregation of the *guṇas* through their mutual interaction and interdependence. Hence, when the *virūpa-pariṇama* takes place, the *guṇas* begin to manifest their various characteristics and the phenomenal products come into being.

---

1. Tattva-vaisaradi-Chapt. II—18
2. Samkhya-pravacana-bhasya—I—61 (sutra)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

This is the dynamism of *Samkhya* physics and this aspect is as real and as obvious as the aspect of permanence. All sorts of movements and changes are so very real and forceful that they can be denied by no means. This fact of becoming should be accepted in every system of philosophy to avoid one-sidedness and narrow perspective. *Guṇas* in the state of equilibrium and the *puruṣa* are the minimum noumenal realities which form the dynamic and the static pre-suppositional principles of the *Samkhya* view. The entire universe of diversity and change is produced out of these *guṇas* in association with the *puruṣa* or pure consciousness. The world we live in, is not a static world; it is out and out dynamic. Perpetual changes, vibrating currents of life and constant movements, are the key notes of this phenomenal show. The world that we see, feel and work upon, does not remain steady and unchanging. On the contrary, it changes, and changes every moment because of its inner push and inner mobility which are due to the palpitating nature of the three *guṇas*. These *guṇas* explain clearly both the sameness and diversity, affinity and difference which are so obvious and unignorable in this physical world. Sameness of objects is due to the sameness of the ultimate stuff; i.e. the 3 reals, but diversity is due to the different types of relatedness of these elements. Cause and effect, substance and attribute are identical from the point of view of the stuff, but from the point of view of forms and names, they are different.

These *guṇas* also form the realistic setting of the Sāmkhya school. Knowledge and its objects belong to the realm of *guṇas* which are totally independent of the *puruṣa*. An idealistic system holds that in the acquisition of knowledge, consciousness contributes every item and that the object of knowledge is convertible into consciousness. But the *Samkhya* philosophers (classical) hold that the stuff of which the object is composed is radically distinct from consciousness and is also independent of it. The whole world therefore rests on a principle which is entirely unrelated to the spiritual entity.

It would, therefore, appear from the above discussion that the Sāmkhya realism and its bed-rock is constituted of three *guṇas*, and that these *gunas* form the central principles of the *Samkhya*

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

view of the world. This interpretation of the *guṇas* as subtle substances or reals has, first of all, been given to us by Bhikṣu in his *Samkhya--pravacana-bhasya*; Vācaspati Miśra and Gaurapāda did not provide us with any explanation of the nature of the gunas from this point of view. Vijñānabhiksu's interpretation of the *guṇas* has been accepted by all eminent Indian scholars like Prof. S.N. Das Gupta, Dr. D.M. Datta, Prof. Rādhā-Krishnān etc. This interpretation alone helps us to understand how *Prakṛti* can be regarded as the primary cause of the evolution of this world.

Prakṛti and the Disturbance of the Prakṛti-State.

In the previous section, it has been stated that the three *guṇas* of the *Samkhya* school constitute the ground-forces from which the diverse transformations and changes of this world have come into being, and that the movement within these *guṇas* either holds these three in a state of equipoise or breaks up their equilibrium just to make them change and develop in the form of this manifold universe. Now, when the *guṇas* are held in a state of equilibrium, and there is no manifestation of any characteristics or modifications, it is called the state of *Prakṛti avyakta* or *Pradhana*. (1) This state of equipoise is absolutely indeterminate, undifferentiated and homogenous and it exists only as the possible source of energy of the whole world. Just as a forest is nothing but an assemblage of different species of trees, in the same way *Prakṛti* is nothing but an assemblage of the three ultimate reals, held in a state of *avyakta* or non-manifestation. (*Guna zva prakrti-sabdavacyah na tutadatirki a Paakrtirastiti*) (2). So, although with the appearance and disappearance of individual objects and beings, *guṇas*, too, seem to appear and disappear, yet, in fact, *guṇas* never get merged into something else, since they themselves are "the Prakṛti" and there is no other entity that can be admitted as their cause or ground. Again, if Prakṛti is the root cause of this world, it should be regarded as an uncaused principle; otherwise there will be the fallacy of infinite regress.

The world process always reveals itself as an unending series of causes and effects and when by following the long line of causa-

1. Samkhya-Pravacana-Bhasya-Sutram-1-61.
2. Yogyvvarttika-Chap. II—18.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

tion, we arrive at the concept of the first or primary cause, we find that this ground principle is to be supposed as eternal, uncaused and beyond the region of this phenomenal existence. This is the *Prakṛti* of the *Samkhya* system. Since, this *Prakṛti* is the uncaused first cause of this vast and multifarious universe, it is unlimited, all pervasive and infinite (*Sarvupadanam pradhanam no pari-chhinnam, vyapakam ityarthah*). (1) Kārikā describes *Prakṛti* as *ahetumat, nityam, vyapi, niskriyam, ekam, anasritam, alingam, niravayavam, svatantram, avyaktam trigunam, aviveki, visaya, samanyam, acetanum* and *prasavadharmi*.(2)

In other words, is *Prakṛti* uncaused, it is eternal and all-pervasive; it is immobile only in the sense that in this *avyakta*-state or *prakṛti*-state, there is no manifestation of products like *mahat, ahamkara* etc. (3) Motion and changes take place also in this equilibriated state. Further, *Prakṛti* is one and is nothing but the unity of the three *guṇas* in a state of potentiality and incoherence. It supports all, being the cause of all, and is not supported by anything else. It is *Alinga*, for it does not serve as the middle term to prove the existence of any other category. *Prakṛti* is also *niravayavi*, since in this state, the production of different evolutes, does not commence. It is independent, un-manifested and unconscious, and is also the objective ground of all cognitions. Again, as such, it is not limited to individual consciousness, but enters into the knowledge of all.

The most important characteristic of *Prakṛti* is that it is out and out productive or *prasavadharmi* (being an assemblage of the three palpilating reals). Primal Nature is ever undergoing changes into forms and categories, thereby creating this phenomenal existence. Being is not the only irreducible ultimate of knowledge or experience, as is held by the *vedanta* philosophers. Movement or becoming is also another inconvertible principle of experience and this principle is *Prakṛti* or *Triguṇa*. Nature has two movements: *anuloma* (forward) and *Pratiloma* (backward). In its forward movement, *Prakṛti* becomes the generating agent of all "sargas", while in the backward movement, it retraces the stages through which it has developed.

1. Samkhya-pravancaa-bhasya—I—76.
2. Samkhyy-kariky-10, 11.
3. Yoga varttika—II-18.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Kārikā also gives rational justification for postulating an *avyakta-prakṛti* as the inexhaustive source of the manifest or *vyakta*. "Because of the finite nature of specific objects, because of homogeneity, because of evolution being due to the efficiency of the cause, because of separation between cause and its product and because of merging of the whole world of effects, there is the unmanifest as the cause". (1) Whatever is finite is itself caused, and all categories, including *mahat* are limited and finite. Hence *mahat* too, is produced by that which has the uncaused potentiality, of *mahat*, that is to say, by the *pradhana* or *Prakṛti*. Again, the sāmkhya theory of *satkarya-vada* holds that the effect is already existent in its cause, and that in every case of causation, we have not the production of some new characteristics, but the uncovering of something already in existence. Hence, a cause can produce that effect only for which it possesses efficiency or potency. All categories, therefore, from *mahat* down to five gross elements, must exist in the state of the unmanifest or *Prakṛti*, before their creation. The effect emerges from the cause and also merges into it at the time of its so-called destruction. The unevolved or the *avyakta*, therefore, must be supposed to exist as the great merging ground of the whole world of experience.

Now, *prakṛti*, in the unevolved state is the equipoise of the three *guṇas* and it evolves the material world out of itself when there is a disturbance in the *guṇa*-equilibrium. The question, therefore arises, "what is it that causes this disturbance of the equilibrium"? The Sāmkhya-answer is that it is due to the *Puruśartha-samyoga* of *Prakṛti* with the inactive *cit*, whose purpose is served by the evolution of nature. Nature is, no doubt, unconscious and unintelligent, still there is some inherent teleology (unconscious) in three *guṇas* for reason of which they produce this world-show. This inherent teleology means nothing but the disposition of unknowingly serving the purposes of *bhoga* and *apavarga* of *puruṣa*. Thus the movement of nature for the production of the world is in a manner controlled and influenced by the transcendental *puruṣa*. Hence, this blind teleological force of *Prakṛti* is also said to be due to the transcendental influence of the spiritual principle." Just as the unintelligent milk flows from the udders of the cow or the nourishment of the calf, so it is the function of the unconscious

1. Samkhya-Karika-15, 16.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

pradhana to liberate the souls from the sorrows and sufferings of this world". (1) This unconscious teleology is, thus, an important hypothesis on the ground of which the *Samkhya*-school seeks to explain the creation of this well-ordered universe by an un-conscious *Prakṛti*, even in the absence of any active guidance from *puruṣa*.

This natural change of the *gunas* in the form of this systematised universe also benefits *prakṛti* to a very great extent. In other words, mutual help or mutual benefit forms the basis of this need for disturbance and evolution. The verse 21 of the *Sāmkhya Kārikā* runs thus: "For the sake of *Puruṣa's* perception of *Prakrti* and for his release a union of the two takes place, which resembles a union of the lame and the blind. By that union, evolution or creation of the world is effected. (2) The *yoga-sūtra* of *Patanjali* says: "The union between *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* takes place for the sake of knowing the essential nature of *puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. (3)

Thus, it is clear and evident that the real object of disturbance in the *guṇa* equilibrium and the creation of the universe is two fold. (1) *Prakṛti* becomes the percept of the *puruṣa* and (2) the *purusa* attains release from the torments and tortures of life on perceiving its distinction from nature.

Being disturbed and dislocated from its state of equipoise by *puruṣartha*, *Prakṛti* creates this manifold world of pleasures and pains; but this world of joys and griefs, happiness and misery gets merged into the *pralaya*-state of Nature, when the *karmas* of the *puruṣas* necessitate a temporary suspension of experience. During *pralaya*, therefore, all things are reduced to the *guṇas* and the *guṇas* themselves become disintegrated forming again the state of equilibrium. The inherent teleology of the *guṇas*, again, at the right moment, breaks up this equilibrated state of *Prakṛti* and gives start to a fresh process of creation. Thus *sṛṣṭi* and *pralaya* (creation and dissolution) are the two functions undertaken by nature to serve the purpose of the spiritual principle.

---

1. Sāmkhya-kārikā-57.
2. Sāmkhya-kārikā-21.
3. Yoga-sūtram—II—23.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Purusa and its Union with Prakṛti

If all the movements of Prakṛti are for the experiences and liberation of puruṣa, then the consideration of puruṣa's nature and its relation to Prakṛti becomes an important problem for the Sāmkhya philosophy.

Prakṛti stands for the unconscious dynamic principle that undergoes changes and transformations for the creation of this empirical world. Although the contents of consciousness always change and become different, "consciousness" as the principle of illumination and revelation remains always the same. So, there are not merely changes and transformations in this universe of ours: there is also the permanent principle of consciousness which manifests all these passing phenomena of the phenomenal world. This eternal principle of consciousness is the purusa in the Sāmkhya analysis of the world. An unconscious principle alone cannot produce a universe which seems to be full of meaning and purpose. Hence at the root of this world, we should admit the existence of spirit (like puruṣa) which, some how, influences the unconscious principle in its process of creation or evolution. Moreover, Prakṛti being unconscious, the contents of experience cannot be synthesised and organised into one meaningful object, by its efforts. The principle of unity that can account for the relatedness of the different bits of experience and also for that reason can give meaning to the contents of experience, must be a spiritual entity of *cit-śakti* and this *cit-śakti* is the puruṣa. Thus, for the creation of this cosmic universe and also for effecting a meaningful knowledge of its objects, (epistemological necessity) a spiritual principle is as necessary as the principle of objectivity and change. Purusa or spirit is pure consciousness and as such it is changeless and infinite. It is transcendental principle, and therefore its real nature, *per se*, is non-apprehensible by experience. It, however, appears as the *a priori* principle in all forms of human knowledge. In other words, purusa is the logical presupposition of all knowledge. Beneath the forms of knowledge, there is some principle which is changeless but which reveals all mental states and processes by its own power of illumination. Puruṣa is this *cit*

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

(or the principle of consciousness) distinct from the idea and images of knowledge. This principle of consciousness is always pure and its nature is intelligence and non-activity. The Sāmkhya-kārikā describes puruṣa as *atriguṇa, viveki, Cetana aprasavadharmi Kevali, Draṣṭā akartā* etc., and all these characteristics reveal that puruṣa and prakṛti are diametrically opposite. While the essence of Prakṛti is change, the essence of puruṣa is changelessness. But, both are equally free and fundamental and both lie at the root of the world and its experience.

The existence of the soul is also proved by certain arguments in the Sāmkhya-kārikā which may be summarised as follows;

Spirit exists (as distinct from matter) since (a) callocations serve a purpose of something other than themselves. (b) Since this other must be the reverse of what is composed of the three constituents. (c) Since there must be control (of the collections) (d) Since there must be an enjoyer and (e) Since there is activity for the purpose of release from threefold misery.(1)

The first four arguments seek to prove the existence of the soul on the ground that as the controller and enjoyer of this world of composite things, some intelligent being must be recognised to exist and that this intelligent being must not be of the nature of pleasure, pain and indifference. The world process, therefore, is not moving and developing aimlessly in a capricious manner. On the contrary, there is the eternal principle of pure intelligence, which, though inactive, yet through reflection, co-ordinates, synthesises and gives meaning to all our worldly experiences. These arguments, therefore, may be regarded as teleological in the sense that they refer to the spirit as the "Central Purpose" of this world of change and mutations. The last argument is based on the scripture which promises release from misery and prescribes activity to that end. Nature or prakṛti is unconscious and therefore the release, striven for must relate to a principle other than Prakṛti, i.e. spirit. This can be accepted as a form of ontological argument for proving the existence of soul or puruṣa. Thus both by teleology and ontology,

1. The Sāmkhya-kārikā-17.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Sāmkhya has sought to prove the existence of the principle of consciousness which is the permanent principle besides prakṛti.

But this self or puruṣa is not one; rather there is the multiplicity of puruṣas and all of them are infinite, unchangeable, all-pervasive and eternal. The plurality of spirits, accordihg to Sāmkhya, follows from "the distributive nature of the incidence of birth and death and of the endowment of the instruments of cognition and action, from bodies, engaging in action, not all at the same time and also from differences in (the proportion of) the three constituents (in different entities like sages, ordinary mortals and beasts).(1) In the absence of such a plurality of souls, birth and death should be one for the whole universe. If one person be blind or deaf, all others should be blind and deaf, but this does not happen in this world. We, here perceive that people are born and die at different times and are differently constituted. How can we then say that there is only one puruṣa and not many? Vikṣu holds that oneness of Spirit, advocated by the Śruti, the vedānta etc., refers to the homogeneous nature of the puruṣas and not to their numerical unity.(2) We cannot say that there is one spirit only and that this one spirit appears as many due to the imposition of different adjuncts, or *upādhis* on it. In the case of space, limited by a chair, the chair can be removed and that portion of space can be saved from limitation by such a removal of its *upādhi*. But there is this possibility that this same portion of space may again be limited by the imposition of some other thing on it.(3) So, if one spirit is recognized, bondage and liberation, limitation and freedom will become absurd and meaningless.

This theory of the multiplicity of souls, no doubt, seems to be very queer and unattractive. But Prof. S.N. Das Gupta has shown, how this theory fits in wonderfully well with the realistic attitude of the Sāmkhya system. He writes: "If the different selves be the reflections upon different *buddhis* from one purusha or *ātmā* as in the vedānta, then the notions of self or personality would be false. For, then, the only true being would be the being of puruṣa. So, the knower being false the known also becomes false, the knower

1. The Sāmkhya-kārikā-18.
2. Sāmkhya-pravacana-bhāsya—I-(154-Sutra).
3. Sāmkhya-Pravacana-bhāsya Chap. I—150.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

and the known having vanished, everything is reduced to that which we can in no way conceive viz., the Brahman..... ..... The Sāmkhya-yoga view does not hold that the knower is false but analyses the nature of the ego and says that it is the seeming unity of *buddhi* and the puruṣa, both of which are reals in the strictest sense of the term".(1) Thus, according to Sāmkhya, puruṣa and prakṛti, the knower and the knowable are not false and fictitious. It is their seeming unity which alone becomes false in the highest state of emancipation, or liberation. Each puruṣa, the real seer, becomes associated with *buddhi* through reflection; and due to this seeming union the experiences of the intelligised *buddhi* are falsely owned by the puruṣa through ignorance. Hence, the subjective ground is as real as the objective one.

Puruṣa is pure consciousness without any movement of any kind, but Prakṛti is impure and changing. When this pure puruṣa, through beginningless ignorance, identifies itself with Prakṛti, the world comes into being. Therefore, the establishment of the relation of Prakṛti with the Puruṣa becomes a very knotty problem in the philosophy of the classical Sāmkhya school. The sāmkhya seeks to solve the problem of this union between the two rigidly distinct principles of Spirit and Nature through its theory of reflection. According to this system, buddhi is an intermediate link between these two opposite principles. Buddhi partakes of the nature of both; (being an evolute of Nature and being essentially *sāttvika* in character). It serves as the reflecting agent, although unspiritual and unconscious in essence. Both puruṣa and Prakṛti are imperceptible and their existence can be known only through inference. Their separateness also cannot be directly grasped by us. The seeming union of puruṣa and Buddhi-sattva, which is a fact of mundane experience, is not true, and it is because of this confused perception, (due to the reflection of *cit* in the buddhi-states) that changes and modifications of the *buddhi* falsely appear as parts and parcels of pure consciousness. But here, we should remember that the Sāmkhya philosopher has never ascribed active initiative to the self even in this false sense. The self is the enjoyer of pleasures and pains and not an agent. The Sāmkhya-kārikā explains

1. Yoga Philosophy in relation to other systems of Indian thought—p. 167. (Prof. S.N. Das Gupta)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the common appearance of the union of the two due to reflection as follows—

"Hence, from their union the non-intelligent *linga* becomes intelligent, as it were, and so, too, though agency is of the constituents, the indifferent one (the spirit) becomes agent as it were". (1) The pure spirit is absolutely in-active and it sees others, through the aid of *Cetana-vad* buddhi. Puruṣa's experience, therefore, is due to the agency of the intelligised buddhi.

Vācaspati Miśra believes only in the intelligisation of buddhi through reflection of consciousness in it. Due to *Sannidhāna* a reflection of *cit* is caught in the buddhi states by virtue of which all buddhi-vṛttis get changed into consciousness. These changes are then interpreted as experiences of the puruṣa.(2) But this *Sannidhi* does not mean any form of spatial or temporal contact. It implies only a special kind of fitness or *yogyatā* on the part of the puruṣa(3) by virtue of which the spirit, though inactive and indifferent yet seems to own the states and processes of the buddhi and thereby, appears as *jñātā*, *bhoktā*, etc. (4)

Vacāspati's view has been criticised on the ground that it fails to give a satisfactory explanation of how puruṣa can be said to become the *bhoktā* of the buddhi-states, when the connection is between its image and the buddhi and not between the buddhi and the real purusa. *Yogyatā* is not a justifiable ground because this, if believed to be the nature of purusa, will continue even in the state of emancipation and therefore purusa's experience will never come to an end and emancipation will become meaningless. Vijñāna-bhikṣu, therefore, gives us his theory of double reflection, which in his opinion explains the contact between the two in a better way. According to him when buddhi is intelligised by the reflection of the puruṣa, it is then reflected back in the spiritual principle as a result of which the notion of an experiencing person emerges.(5)

---

1. Kārikā-20.
2. Tattva-vaiśāradī-Chap. I—4.
3. Tattva vaiśāradī—II—23 (Tika)
4. Tattva vaiśāradī—II-23 (Tika)
5. Yoga Vārttika—I—4.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

This type of *Samyoga* through double reflection does not affect the unchangeable character of spirit, because change always means creation of new qualities (1) and no new quality will be generated in the soul as a result of its union with buddhi.

The motion of a person or experiencer thus arises when the *cit* is reflected in the buddhi and the apparently intelligised buddhi with its modifications, is again reflected back in the purusa. Thus, while Vācaspati Miśra simply intelligises buddhi, Vijñāna-bhikṣu also phenomenalises the transcendental self in order to explain the experiences of this life in *samsāra*.

The life of *samsāra* continues for an ordinary person so long as this mutual reflection continues through the action of Prakṛti. The actual enjoyer is the "empirical ego" formed with the reflection of consciousness in the buddhi united with its own conceptional determinations; but either through *yogyatā* or through double reflection, the various experiences of this fictious self are owned by the real self as it were, and they appear as the experiences of the purusa. In other words, purusa fails to distinguish itself from intelligized buddhi and its modifications which are taken as identical with itself through ignorance.

This rise of this phenomenal self or *prativimva* puruṣa is of course very important for explaining the *bhoga* and the *apavarga* of the ever free soul, although the classical Sāmkhya does not undertake the task of giving a thorough explanation of the nature and status of this *prativimva* purūṣa. It is perhaps due to the fact that this empirical self resides in the buddhi, or rather it is the buddhi in its intelligised form, and, therefore, apparently in their opinion, it needs no separate treatment or separate dealings. Buddhi resembles puruṣa in transparency and this is the point of affinity between these two principles. Due to this similarity, purusa comes in contact with buddhi (through reflection). In this stage of conjunction, non-distinction of the puruṣa from buddhi exists and this non-discrimination or *aviveka* is the root cause of all sorrows and sufferings of the world.

---

1. Yoga Vārttika—II—23.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

SECTION B

Evolution

The Sāmkhya system believes that Prakṛti or Nature is the state of equilibrium of the three guṇas which originally remain in a form of disintegration and disunion bringing no categories into existence. This equilibriated form was in existence before the creation of this present world, because that was the state of dissolution or deep sleep and the consequent suspension of all creative activities. But due to the relationship of Nature with spirit brought about by the transcendental influence of the puruṣa, a commotion and a dislocation of prakṛti from this state of equipoise takes place, with the result, that the evolution of different categories in their own graduated series, immediately starts in the collocation of the guṇa-reals. The guṇas, in their varied groupings and different relations of subordination and super-ordination, gradually evolve from their indeterminate bosom, products of more and more determinate forms. In this act of creation, however, the guṇas retain their specific characters. In every evolute, the three guṇas remain present, although the character of the evolute is always determined by the nature of the predominant one.

This activity of prakṛti resulting in the creation of the world process is spontaneous and free in the sense that it does not receive any kind of active guidance from the spiritual principle. Just as a bundle of unintelligent grass changes into milk in the body of the cow for the nourishment of the calf, in the same way, Nature creates unconsciously, although its creation is meant for the purposes of enjoyment and liberation of souls or spirits. The spirit enjoys natural products; and through such enjoyment, discriminative knowledge arises which brings about the release of the puruṣa. The Sāmkhya-kārikā says "that the union of purusa and Prakṛti is like the association of a lame man and a blind man, because by means of this union the purposes of both spirit and Nature are realised."(1) Nature binds puruṣa by providing it with so many objects of pleasure and enjoyment and then helps the spirit to attain release by the acquisition of true knowledge. Of course, both

1. The Sāmkhya-kārikā-21.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

these purposes are served unknowingly by Nature and therefore, almost mechanically, as there is not the minutest spark of consciousness or intelligence in the elemental structure of Prakṛti. The guṇas are so constituted that they act by their inherent forces in a definite direction and that the products, thus created, become useful for the purposes of the transcendental principle.

The process of evolution follows a definite law which is almost inviolable. Dr. B.N. Seal has stated it thus:

"The process of evolution consists in the development of the differentiated within the undifferntiated, of the determinate within the indeterminate, of the co-herent within the incoherent. The order of succession is neither from parts to the whole, nor from the whole to the parts but even from relatively less differentiated, less determinate, less co-herent whole to a relatively more differentiated, more determinate and more co-herent whole"(1). The evolutionary passage, therefore, is not from simplicity to complexity but from the indeterminate to the determinate, from homogeneity to heterogeneity and from the more subtle to the less subtle or gross.

Now, this process of gradual emergence of categories is beginningless or *anādi* in the sense that the cyclic order of creation and dissolution of the world is taking place from time immemorial, without any break. A particular creation or a particular dissolution, of course, does take place in a particular point of time and is not, therefore, beginningless.

The disturbance of Prakṛti does not, however, mean the disturbance of the whole equilibrium, because in that case Prakṛti will not be in a position to refill an evolute that will naturally be exhausted in the act of creating its own effect.(2) The guṇas are infinite in number and only a large number of them is dislodged from the state of equilibrium. We should remember that according to the Sāmkhya, Prakṛti is not only the source of energy that is needed for the formation of the world, but also it is an inexhaustive source which is constantly making good the loss sustained by the different evolutes in the act of creating their respective effects and stadia.

1. Dr. B.N. Seal—Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus p. 7.
2. Yoga-varttika—II—19.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The Sāmkhya concept of evolution really means the gradual development of different categories of existence and not mere changes of qualities or new combinations of the objects of the same order. The table is not made of reality different from the wood of which it is a modification, because both of them belong to the same order of gross material substance. The production of gross elements from gross elements is not regarded as a case of evolution but as one of mere combination. Creation, therefore, ceases with the production of the gross elements of *bhūtas*. In the words of Prof. S.N. Das Gupta, "Each of the stages of evolution remains as a permanent category of being and offers scope to the more and more differentiated and co-herent groupings of the succeeding stages. Thus, it is said that the evolutionary process is regarded as a differentiation of new stages."(1) The evolutes of Praṛkti do not separate themselves from Nature but remain within its body in more and more determinate forms. The *tattvas* (categories) which emanate from the indeterminate bosom of Prakṛti in a graduated series are as follows:

"From Nature issues Mahat, from this issues Ahamkāra, from which proceed the set of sixteen, from the five of this set of 16 proceed the five elementary substances."(2)

The first evolute of Prakṛti, therefore, is 'Mahat' or 'Buddhi' which is predominantly *sāttvika* in character. This is also known as *Jagat-vija*, (seed of the world) since the rest of the world emanates from this category. In its psychological aspect, it is known as buddhi, but in its cosmic aspect, it is called *mahat* or the great principle. This first principle (Buddhi) is not individual or particular. It includes within it the buddhis of all puruṣas and is for that reason, called the *buddhi-tattva*. It exists as an all-comprehensive principle, and therfore the potency of both the *sargas* (i.e. physical and mental) remains impregnated in it. It is because of this universal character of the first evolute, that the world becomes the common objective ground of experience for all persons. Had it been individual, then each *Jiva* would have formed his own world of experience and there would not have been a common

1. History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. I-p. 247.
2. Sāmkhya-kārikā-22.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

platform to facilitate co-consciousness of a mind independent object. This first intellectual evolute is in itself unconscious, but it becomes intelligised by the reflection of purusa's consciousness in it, and this reflected 'Cetanā', being united with the conceptual determinations of the "Buddhi", creates the phenomenal self, which actually undergoes the various experiences of pleasures and pains. Puruṣa, the true seer, remains all the while beyond all impurities, and its identification with the intelligised buddhi, and also its appropriation of all the experiences of our phenomenal personality is only a transcendental illusion. This illusion is wholly due to the operation of *avidya* and it the root cause of bondage and sufferings.

The special function of *buddhi* is ascertainment and decision. Man makes decisions about things by virtue of this principle which exists in him as his special inner organ. It is the ground of all intellectual processes of all individual selves and also of the whole universe. Senses and the mind function for *buddhi*, but *buddhi* functions directly for the good of the *puruṣa*.

This *Mahat* or *buddhi* is further disturbed in three different ways by the respective predominance of the three different *guṇas* and the state of *mahat* which is thus differently disturbed is known as *ahamkāra* or ego-consciousness. The three lines in which it develops are known as *sāttvika*, *rājasa* and *tāmasa* (otherwise known as *vaikārika*, *taijasa* and *bhūtādi*)). *Ahamkāra* is, no doubt, a more determinate form of the *mahat*, but nevertheless, it remains integrated in all its three forms within the great principle, from which it has been generated. The function of *Ahamkāra* is *abhimāna* or self-assertion. It induces *puruṣa* to wrongly consider itself as the agent of actions. The senses present the immediate indeterminate impressions to the mind and these impressions are then synthesised by mind by assimilation and discrimination. Then they are referred to the principle of integration or egohood. Lastly, they are determined by the *buddhi* which hands them over to the self. From *Ahamkāra* in its *sattvika* aspect arise eleven organs, i.e. the five organs of perception, five of action and mind. This view, we find in the Sāmkhya-Kārikā as well as in Vācaspati's *tattva kaumudi*. But Vijñāna-bhikṣu's view is slightly different, although this difference is not of much significance for the purpose of under-

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

standing the general trend of evolution. In his opinion, mind alone springs forth from *sāttvika ahamkāra*; other sense-organs are derived from *rājasa ahamkāra* or *taijasa ahamkāra*. The five *tanmātras*, however, are derived from the *bhūtādi* or *tāmasa-ahamkāra* which is a more integrated form within the *mahat*. The physical reals, therefore, are not directly derived from *mahat*, but through the intermediate state of *tāmasa-ahamkāra*. This is the view discussed in the Sāmkhya Kārikā(1). But in the *Vyasa-bhāsya* of *Yoga-sūtra*, the five subtle elements and the ego are mentioned as being the six *aviśeṣa-pariṇāma* of *mahat*. All of them remain integrated within that great principle.(2)

Prof. Das Gupta has accepted this view of the *yoga-sūtra* regarding the genesis of the *tanmātras*, since in his opinion, the *tāmasa* side of *ahamkāra* cannot be one with the *sāttivika* aspect of the ego which is essentially different from it. It should rather be regarded as *tāmasa—mahat* containing within it the seeds of the objective series. "Its inclusion in *ahamkāra* with the other two phases is due to the fact that all the three of them are associated and taken up in the very first moment of the oscillatory movement in the *mahat*. The successive accretions of *tanmātras* for the formation of the *tanmātras* are made from the *mahat* through *bhūtādi*; or rather the *bhūtādi* represents the *tamas* side of *mahat* which is in a state of activity by the inherent *rajas* for the formation of the *tanmātras*."(2) Of course it is true that the *tāmasa ahamkāra* contains within it a greater quantity of *tamoguna* than what is present in the *sattvika-Ahamkara*, and that the quantitative inequality of the *guna*—reals generally creates qualitative differences in the different evolutes, thereby bringing into existence dissimilar things and their diverse qualities. Still, it may be pointed out that according to the *Samkhya*-philosophy, the subjective series is never entirely dissimilar to the objective series as both of them have emanated from a common source. Hence, the distinction between the *satvika ahamkara* and the *tamasa ahamkara* will be with regard to their specific characters only, and not with regard to their essential nature (as compounds of three gunas). Moreover, evolution means

1. Karikā-22.
2. Yoga Philosophy in relation to the other systems of Indian thought, (Prof. S. N. Das Gupta—page 186.)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

differentiation in integration. So, we can very well say that all evolutes are integrated either in the body of the *avyakta* or in the body of the *Mahat*, the great principle of the *vyakta*-world. Here, the six *aviśeṣas* are taken together and the *mahat* has been mentioned as their common source. In the *Vyasa-bhasya* of Yoga-sutram (1-45) *ahamkara* has been definitely mentioned as the source of the *tanmatras*. In fact, *buddhi* cannot really act without a distinction of the universe into subject and object and this distinction is to be made by *ahamkara*. Hence, the palpitating *mahat* changes into *ahamkāra*, which in the first moment of evolution appears as a mere general state of undifferentiated subjectivity and objectivity; and then a part of this undifferentiated mass under the predominating influence of *sattva*, develops into specific organs of individuals along with the definite sense of individuality (individual ego-sense). The remaining portion comes under the influence of *tamas* and is called the *Bhūtādi*, and this part becomes the basis of the objective world. This *bhūtādi*, being a part of the original undifferentiated mass, includes within it all the egos in a potential and undifferentiated form and hence the world that is created becomes a common objective world and not a private belonging of one individual. (*Ahamkāra* is the principle of both subjectivity and objectivity, since subject and object are relative terms.)

The state of *bhūtādi* is absolutely homogeneous without any characteristics save its massiveness, and this state through the working of *rajas* on it, produces five *tanmatras* which are also *aviśeṣas* in the sense that they do not possess specific characteristics, like gentleness, frightfulness etc. They are infra-sensible and therefore cannot be directly known by the powers of senses of the ordinary human beings. But these *tanmatras* are not as undifferentiated and indeterminate as the mere mass or *bhūtādi*. There is some differentiation in the *tanmātric* stage, as they are already called *sabda-tanmatra*,, *sparsa-tanmatra* etc. Regarding the genesis of the *tanmatras*, *yoga varttika* gives us the following account. *Bhūtādi* produces the sound potential with the help of the element of *rajas*. The sound potential, then, with a further addition from *bhūtādi*, gives rise to the touch potential, this with a further addition from *bhūtādi* creates the *rūpa tanmātra*. The other *tanmātras* also are derived in a similar fashion.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

From *tanmātras*, by further process of evolution, the five gross atoms are generated. These are either air, fire, water and earth. These are called *viśeaṣas*, for they possess specific characters, including spatial dimensions and on account of this they can be distinguished as large and small. Now, though these five elements are called atoms, they are not partless like the atoms of the *vaiśesikas*. They are the more specialised forms of the partless subtle, and non-sensible *tanmātras* existing simply as potentialities of the material world. According to Vacaspati, *ākāsa-bhūta* is derived from the *ākāsa tanmātra* only, the air-atom from *sabda* and *sparsa tanmātras*, the fire atom, from *sabda*, *sparsa* and *rūpa tanmātras*, the ap-atom from *sabda*, *sparsa*, *rūpa* and *rasa tanmātras*, the earth atom has developed from all the five *tanmātras*. Vijnana-bhiksu gives a slightly different account of the genesis of the atoms in the sense that in his opinion *akasa* atom has originated from *akasa-tanmātra* with an addition from the *bhūtadi*.

These gross atoms cannot be developed into any other order of existence and so, according to the view of the Samkhya, the evolution of the world stops at this point. Evolution really means *tatvantara-parinama*, and as this does not take place after the evolution of the gross-atoms, these *paramanus* constitute the last stadium in the evolutionary flow of nature. These gross elements, however, undergo ceaseless changes but these changes are either *dharmaparinama* or *laksana* and *avastha parinamas*. Objects always change their qualities or appearance as is generally noticed in the case of a lump of clay, changing into the form of a pot. This is called *Dharma-parinama*. Again, all the changes may be viewed as existing in an object as sublatent, actual and latent which may be termed as past, present and future. So, the appearance of a thing may be apprehended from the point of view of the three stages, the unmanifested (future), the manifested (present) and the previously manifested or the "past". An object will come into being, it comes into being and it is no more—these are the three stages which the object passes through, and these changes constitute the *laksana-parinama* of the thing. Then the thing passes through the stages of old and new and this constitutes its *avastha-parinama*. These three forms of changes are all that can be seen in the present form of transformation, and so the evolution of newer and newer stadia is no longer found in this world.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The most important point regarding the evolution of the Samkhya-system is that although the ultimate evolving agent is regarded as an unconscious principle, it does not give us any mechanical interpretation of the evolutionary process like the Darwinian theory of the Westerners. Darwinian theory believes in chance-variation; but why this chance variation leading to the creation of new species comes into being: this, the mechanical theory of Darwin cannot satisfactorily explain. But the Samkhya philosophy asserts that all these changes or modifications take place because of the teleology inherent in Nature. To be of service to the purusa is the central purpose in Nature and this goal guides the whole course of the process of evolution through its different stages.

Further, according to the Samkhya theory, there is no distinction between power and the possessor of power. So, Nature and all its evolutes are both *dravya* and *Sakti* (Substantive entity and power). *Mahat*, *ahamkāra* and *tanmātra* are all substantive entities and are not as such distinct from their respective powers of transformation into the succeeding categories. Each of them is a substance and is also a potential power which finds actual modification in the succeeding product. Thus, *mahat* is intelligence-stuff but it is also the potential ego-hood that springs forth from it. All *viśeṣa* and *aviśeṣas* are thus the actualisation of the latent powers embodied in *prakrti*—the ultimate source of inexhaustive potency and dynamism.

Time and space, too, are not independent of *Prakrti*; they are dependent on the *ākaśa* and its *upadhis* in the form of finite objects. Limited space and limited time arise from the *ākaśa* when it becomes limited and determined by the adjuncts, but the eternal time and the eternal space are the same as Nature (1). The minutest part of limited time is called a moment and the minutest part of an object, an atom. The time that will be needed by an atom for changing its own point of space is measured as one moment. All objects and conditions of the world are constantly undergoing changes and the changes generate in our intellect, a sense of sequence of events which we perceive as time. Each unit of change is measured as one moment. Collocation of these moments gives rise to

1. Sāmkhya-Pravacana-bhāsya—II—12.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

our concept of *danda*, hour, day, night etc. This act of measuring time and understanding the evolutionary process in a temporal fashion is wholly a function of our *buddhi*. Hence in yoga sutra, succession and collocation of moments have been described as *buddhi-nirmana*. Modern physics also refers to this subjective nature of the measurable time, and it describes time as the fourth dimension of space. The following extract from Dr. K.R. Sen's article on "Relationship between the body and the mind" will indicate clearly how time has been viewed as purely subjective in modern physics.

"Time, as a physicist understands it, may be said to originate in our consciousness as the perception of the sequential" occurrence of events of our experience. As such, then, while the events may be largely or even wholly objective, human conception of time is clearly subjective. This subjective consciousness exhibits an over all identity among individuals, because it is built up by common or similar categories of experiences and by actual training in the matter of co-ordination. It is indeed well known that time is a matter of an advanced co-ordinated perception with individuals and not a direct primary one. Thus it is that a growing child develops its sense of time at a much later stage than when the senses of colour, sound and space have got developed one by one. One has got to train one's senses in order to comprehend time"..... (*The Journal of Science Club—Vol. VI page* 64—*Calcutta.*)

He further says, in the same article: "The ingredient of the concept of time in relation to the events of the objective world is beautifully illustrated by Einstein's humorous exposition of the relativity principle to a non-scientist friend. His statement amounted to that if one was in company of some fine girls', an hour would seem like being only just a minute; on the other hand, if one happened to be sitting on a stove, a minute would appear like an hour". (*The Journal of Science Club—Vol. VI page* 65—*Calcutta.*)

From the above discussion on evolution, it is clear that all objects of the world, without a single exception, are the creations of the three moving reals: and consequently, at every moment, every object of this finite universe is undergoing modification or change. The potential is thus becoming the actual in course of such transformation and movement, and the actual also is constantly becoming

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the sublatent. This transition or passage, from the potential to the actual, is what is known as the causal transformation and, therefore, for grasping more clearly the nature of the evolutionary changes, a consideration of the Samkhya theory of causation becomes urgent and unavoidable.

The Sāmkhya Theory of Causation:

The Sāmkhya theory of causation is based primarily on the principle that whatever is non-existent cannot be brought into existence, and that whatever is existent cannot be made totally non-existent. The corrollary that follows logically from this principle is this: The effect that is produced from the cause is not totally dissimilar to it, as no intercourse is possible between two absolutely distinct entities. Of course, these two tenets are not so fully and clearly stated in the Sāmkhya philosophy, yet the whole trend of discussion on the problem of causation suggests these two principles as its basic implications. The details of the theory are logically woven from these two, although the Sāmkhya-philosophers were not conscious of this fact. What this theory of causation has sought to prove is not the existence of the effect as such, but the existence of the effect in the cause prior to its production. The verse nine of the *Sāmkhya-Kārikā* runs thus—"the effect exists (even prior to the operation of the cause) since what is non-existent cannot be brought into existence by the operation of a cause, since there is recourse to the appropriate material cause, since there is not production of all by all, since the potent cause effects only that of which it is capable, and since the effect is non-different from the cause."(1)

The first argument states precisely that the non-existent can never be brought into existence. Blue can never be turned into yellow even by the combined efforts of a thousand artists. It is also a matter of our daily experience that one who wishes to produce a particular effect, seeks the appropriate material cause. For example, if any body intends to produce butter, he chooses milk as its *upādāna* and not water. Again, if the effect were non-existent in the cause prior to its production, then anything could come out of anything which really does not happen in this world. Moreover, a cause can produce that effect only for which it possesses

1. Kārikā-9.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

potency and power. Milk produces curd, because it is capable of producing that particular effect. Lastly, the relation between the cause and the effect is a relation of identity in difference and not of mere difference without identity. Thus the cloth does not differ essentially from the threads—its cause. They are different in forms, but identical in essence. So the relation between the two is spoken of here as the relation of identity in difference. The effect emerges from the energy of the cause and is therefore of the same substance. Having taken into account all these points, regarding the relation of cause and effect, the Sāmkhya school holds that the effect is pre-existent in the cause. Before actual production, the effect exists in the *guṇa* collocation in the form of potential energy on account of certain obstacles which prevent its actualisation; but as soon as the barriers are removed, the energy gets a free passage and produces the necessary transformation known as the effect. Thus, conservation and transformation of matter and energy from one form to another seem to be the basis of the Sāmkhya theory of causation. The effect is only the cause, transformed and modified in a new fashion. Like causes always produce like effects, leaving no place for miracle and supernatural forces. The Sāmkhya theory of causation has, in this respect, some similarity with the Aristotelian view of causation, as Aristotle also used to believe in the maxim: "Something can never come out of nothing." Causation is nothing but the transition from the potential being to the actual being. A similar echo is also audible in the philosophy of Hegel who declared causation as a passage from the implicit to the explicit. Cause and effect are, indeed, the potential and the actual forms of the same matter and energy.

Since the cause and the effect are the undeveloped and the developed states of one and the same substance, all production is development and all destruction is disappearance into the cause. There is no such thing as utter destruction or annihilation.

But when we say that the effect exists in the cause before its creation, we must not suppose that it exists as such in the *upādāna* or the material from which it will be subsequently derived. It pre-exists in the cause only in the form of power or *śakti* and not in the form of a full-fledged effect. Therefore, the effect, in its potential form or causal form, cannot serve the same purpose: that

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

can be served by it in its actual form. When the existing force, that obstructs the manifestation, is removed, the conserved power or energy receives a natural flow and appears in a new shape or new form (i.e. the effect).

Now, in an act of production, we generally make a distinction between the efficient cause and the material cause. While the material cause enters into the effect, the efficient cause exercises influences from outside for the removal of the impediments. Milk is the material cause of butter and the churning machine that removes all obstacles, barring the manifestation of the said effect, is the efficient cause. There are some barriers, however, which cannot be removed in the ordinary manner and these act as the regulating forces for directing the course of the evolutionary flow through some definite channels. These are space, time, form and causality. We cannot expect a human baby to be born of a cow simply because of the resistance offered by "form" against such manifestation. If these *niyā makas* (regulating forces) were not in operation, then the current of evolution could flow in any and every direction.

This theory of causation, offered by the Sāmkhya school, is termed as *Satkārya-vāda* and *pariṇāma vāda*, as it states that the effect pre-exists in the cause and that the effect is a real transformation of the cause. (Oil pre-exists in the oil-seeds before creation, and it is also an actual transformation of its causal form). This law of causation is at the root of the Sāmkhya-conception of evolution. Creation or *sristi* is nothing but the process of transforming the implicit into the explicit form. *Ahamkāra* remains in an implicit state in the *Mahat* and the *mahat* in *Prakṛti*. When the barriers are removed, and the *guṇas* are thrown out of balance, *Prakṛti* changes into the form of the great principle, the great principle into *ahamkāra* and so on and so forth.

Although this law of causation reveals to us a continuous process of becoming, yet at the very root of it something eternal is clearly admitted, and this eternal principle, though essentially mutative, is still the underlying support of all changes and mutations. Becoming is the becoming of some dynamic force and so the changes here are not hanging in the air or nothingness; change is merely the change of form and not the production of something new and un-

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

foreseen. We should, however, remember that the production of more and more determinate things is in operation simply for serving the purposes of enjoyment and liberation of the spiritual principle. *Puruṣa*, indeed, is inactive and static; yet like a magnet the soul passively attracts *Prakṛti* and compels her to evolve and change for the creation of this world. We can conclude by saying that while *Prakṛti* is the *upādāna-kāraṇa* of the world, *puruṣa* is its *sthiti-kāraṇa* since the soul's end or purpose is the only preservative force that maintains the existence of this phenomenal creation.

SECTION C

Samkhya—Atheism

An important question still to be decided regarding the philosophy of Sāmkhya is:

"Does the Sāmkhya system admit the existence of God or is it an atheistic system?" Sāmkhya philosophy, already discussed, recognises the existence of two principles, static and dynamic, which build up a comprehensive doctrine for explaining the being and becoming of the whole universe. The inherent teleology in Prakṛti demands that the creation should proceed in a manner that will be beneficial and helpful to *puruṣa* either in the direction of enjoyment or in the direction of salvation. The purpose of the *puruṣa* passively guides and controls all the activities of the *guṇas* and so the introduction of another conscious being or *Iśvara*, as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the world is apparently not needed in this system of philosophy. "The Sāmkhya-sūtra' therefore gives us two series of arguments in two chapters (1 & 5) to prove its non-theistic character. The first series of arguments as stated in the sūtras of the 1st chapter of the "Sāmkhya pravacana bhāṣya" run as follows:

(a) "On account of the non-proof of *Iśvara*."

(b) "As *Iśvara* can be neither free, nor bound, nor be anything of a different character, there is no proof of his existence."

(c) "If free from desires and attachments, He cannot be the creator and if bound, He must be as ignorant as we are. So, He cannot exist as the creator God".

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

(d) "The sacred texts, which speak of Īśvara, are either glorifications of the free self or homages paid to one made perfect by yoga" (1).

The above arguments may be summed up for recording the atheistic character of the traditional *Sāmkhya*. God does not exist, for if He exists, He must be either bound or liberated. A bound spirit cannot be accepted as God because of his attachment with merit and demerit, nor can a freed soul be regarded as the creator-God, as He would have no desire to act and create this manifold world. Hence, God cannot be admitted as the agent in the process of creation because of His liberated and non-attached nature. Nor can we say that God has undertaken the task of creatng this universe, disinterestedly, for the good of his own creatures only. The world is so full of sins and sufferings that it cannot be said to be the creation of a Good God who works only for the benefit of his own off-springs.

The 5th chapter contains some tenets which, too, when interpreted, disprove the existence of an eternal God. God is supposed to create the world of pleasures and pains for all living beings in accordance with the law of *karma*. The wrong doers are punished with pain and suffering but the doers of good deeds are blessed with pleasures. If this is so, then let *karma* alone become the agent of the products of action; what need is there of a creator God? The actions produce their own consequences naturally. So, there is no need of God for that purpose. Again God cannot be supposed to work for his own benefit, which is absurd on the face of His perfect and pure nature; and even if He is supposed to act for His own good, He will be no better than an ordinary human being who generally acts for his own interest only. If it is admitted that *Īśvara* acts like a magnet through mere proximity, then the proximity of *Puruṣa* which has already been accepted would be sufficient for causing the distrubance of *Prakṛti*. *Īśvara* cannot be perceived; nor can His existence be inferred in the absence of a suitable *vyāpti*-

1. Sāmkhya-*Pravacana-bhāṣya*-Chap I (Sūtrāni).
   (a) Īśvarasiddheḥ (92).
   (b) Muktavaddhayoranyatarābhā-vān-na-tatsiddhiḥ (93)
   (c) Ubhayathapyasat karatavam.
   (d) Muktātmānaḥ praśamasā upāsāsiddhasyavā (95).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

jñāna in this direction. The scriptural texts also speak of *pradhāna* or *Prakṛti* as the creative agent of this world. So, the existence and causality of an eternal God cannot be proved by any means.(1) The *Sāmkhya Kārikā*, however, does not indulge in any such refutation of God, but simply remains silent over the problem.

Thus, the atheistic attitude of the Sāmkhya is the result of its recognition of an inherent teleology in *Prakṛti* and also of its acceptance of the law of *Karma* which determines the births and the rebirths, the pleasures and pains of all creatures of the universe. The functions assigned generally to God (i.e. creation, preservation, etc.) are discharged by *Prakṛti* with the help of *Puruṣa* and in accordance with the law of *Karma* and these therefore are the least possible concepts necessary for understanding the universe.

Of course there is another interpretation, according to which the Sāmkhya-system is not an atheistic one. Vijñāna-bhikṣu for instance is more inclined to a theistic interpretation of the Sāmkhya(2) as is evident from his writings in the Sāmkhya-Pravacana-bhāṣya. In his *vijñānamṛta-bhāṣya* too he has quoted passages from the *purāṇas* and the *Smṛtis* to establish the view that *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* merge in the end in *Iśvara*,—the real controller of evolution and dissolution. The refutation of God in the aphorisms of s-p-s has been regarded by Vijñānabhikṣu as a mere *praurivāda*. In other words, in his opinion the *sūtra-kāra* has simply tried to establish the truth that the Sāmkhya metaphysics is sound enough to explain all our experiences even without the assumption of God. Mr. A.K. Mazumdar in his Sāmkhya conception of personality has taken great pains to prove that the classical Sāmkhya is theistic in character. What the Sāmkhya denies is not the existence of an eternal God as such, but the causality and agency of such a God. *Iśvara* is not the direct cause of the world. He may be regarded as the indirect cause, since in Mr. Mazumdar's opinion, *Prakṛti* has acquired the power of creation by virtue of its proximity to an eternally freed God or *Iśvara*. Causality is not equivalent to existence. So, if the former is denied, the latter remains unrefuted. "It does not and cannot purport to indicate anything concerning the existence

1. The Sāmkhya-pravacana-bhāsya-Chap. 5.
2. S-P-b Chapter III 57.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

of *Iśvara* for the simple reason that the disproof of His casuality does not imply in any way the disproof of His existence: He may not be a cause, but that does not necessarily imply that He does not exist also. He may exist, though He may not be a cause; that is, he may exist in another form for instance as an indifferent spectator.(1)

Mr. Mazumdar has assigned to his eternal God, the status and position of a transcendental *puruṣa*. God, too, induces *Prakṛti* to evolve and change only by means of proximity. But we do not understand wherein lies the necessity of recognising a third category like *Iśvara* when the other two categories (*Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*) are sufficient for the purpose of giving a full explanation of life and the universe around us. The law of parsimony should be obeyed under all conditions.

Moreover, the conception of *Iśvara* generally carries with it the conception of a creator, as otherwise, it ceases to exist as an essential condition for creating the world. If the power of creation is taken away from God, He loses all strength and significance, as is the case with Him in the Yoga system. According to this system also, the creation of the world is due to the contact of *Prakṛti* with *Puruṣa*, and therefore from the point of view of Yoga-physics too, God does not seem to occupy very important place. He exists simply because He is supposed to bring about the association and dissociation of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* for creation and dissolution of the universe. He also removes the obstacles in the path of His devotee by placing him under conditions, most suitable for the attainment of Yoga. Hence, devotion to God is regarded as one of the alternative means for the attainment of *Samādhi*. But so far as *upādāna Kāraṇa* and *sthiti kāraṇa* of the world are concerned, both the Sāmkhya and the Yoga admit the existence of two categories only, i.e. *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. The will of any free being like God does not lie at the root of this creative process, and so God is not a necessary factor in the creation of this world of pain and pleasures. The denial of any theoretical necessity of *Iśvara* for understanding the physical and phychical natures of this world, is the main reason for undermining the importance of God in the *Yoga* philosophy although it has taken so much pain for becoming a theistic system.

1. Sāmkhya-conception of personality-by A.K. Mazoomdar page 14.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Liberation as expounded in the Philosophy of Sāmkhya :

Our life, on earth constantly swings like a pendulum between pleasures and pains, happiness and misery. Even if it is possible for a man to shun all other pains and pleasures, it is impossible for him to resist decay and death. Of course, all men earnestly strive to remove every kind of pain and misery, but so long as we remain on the empirical level only, we cannot enjoy unmixed and pure pleasure or happiness. This is the most important truth regarding our life on earth. So, if a man is to rise above the level of this sorrowful existence, he must, first of all, realise that all worldly pleasures lead to sorrow and that no worldly means can remove for ever the sufferings of this empirical life. The Sāmkhya system has started with an analysis of three kinds of misery that generally destroy the pleasures of life. These are the *adhyātmika* pain, *ādhibhautika* pain and the *ādhidaivika* pain. The first kind is caused by the disorders of the mind-body system. It includes under it fever, anger, greed, fear etc. The second is produced by external agents like other men, beasts, natural forces, etc. The third kind is produced by supernatural causes, e.g., the pains inflicted by ghosts and demons etc.

All these evils of life cannot be removed either by science or by religious practices and other known means. The performance of sacrifices, according to *vedic* rites, may remove pain for a short period but as these actions involve the sacrifices of animals, they must ultimately produce pain and not pleasure. Again, physical disease can be cured by medicine and mental pain by indulgence in pleasures. But this sort of relief, too, is very short-lived, as there will be recurrence of such mental and physical ailments. The knowledge of science and performance of religious sacrifices cannot, therefore, lead to the final annihilation of sufferings and pains, though these ordinary means have a limited value in making life at least tolerably happy on this earth. Hence the question arises, how are we to attain absolute freedom from all pain and suffering ? The Sāmkhya says that all our misery is really due to ignorance. *Buddhi* and *Puruṣa* are distinct and different; but through ignorance, a seeming unity between the two is wrongly established by us, as a result of which sorrows and sufferings, pain and misery which really

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

belong to *buddhi*, seem to follow us from birth to birth. It is necessary, therefore, that through discriminatory knowledge, we should form in *buddhi* the true conception of the nature of *puruṣa* and then with the help of this saving knowledge, we shall be able to attain liberation from the sorrows and sufferings of this world.

Change is in *Prakṛti* alone and it is the body that grows old and dies. The spirit is ever free but through misconception, bondage and liberation are attributed to the self. When the self is conceived of as bound and fettered, it experiences all the sorrows and joys that really happen to its case, i.e. the body. When discriminative knowledge is attained, Nature ceases to evolve; the seeming unity is destroyed and self attains release, which is the real object of Nature's evolution. We suffer pain and enjoy pleasure because the experiencing subject wrongly identifies itself with the knowable objects (dṛśya) involving pleasures and pains. *Draṣṭa* and *Dṛśya* will be perfectly discriminated from each other through the purification of *buddhi* or the intellect. Although, the *buddhi* is predominantly *sāttvika* in nature, yet under ordinary conditions, the *sattva guṇa* in the intellect remains associated with the *rajas* and *tamas* and for that reason the true nature of the *puruṣa* is not visible in it. But when through a long course of spiritual training *buddhi* becomes entirely free from the touch of *rajas* and *tamas*, it becomes almost similar to the *Puruṣa* in purity and transparence. In that purified condition of the *buddhi*, is reflected the true nature of the spiritual principle, and so the 'buddhi' feels itself to be different from and unrelated to the pure and transcendental soul, as a result of which ignorance of the *jīva* is totally destroyed. Under such circumstances, Nature turns its back on the liberated *puruṣa* and ceases its activity of binding such a self to this life of *samsāra*. It should, however, be remembered that with the attainment of release by a single *puruṣa*, *prakṛti* does not cease to function. There are other *puruṣas* who are still to be liberated, and Nature goes on working in her own way for the release of those bound selves. The released *puruṣa* too perceives *prakṛti*, but is no longer deluded by her powers of creation. In that state of release both the principles exist; what has been brought to an end is the delusion under which *puruṣa* thought that the evolutes of nature are its own creations and therefore identical with itself.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The Sāmkhya-kārikā says *tena nivṛtta-prasavām arthavasāt sapta-rūpa vinivrttām.*
Prakṛtim Pas yati Puruṣah,
prekṣaka-vad avasthitaḥ Svacchah.

"Thereby does the pure spirit resting like a spectator, perceive primal nature which has ceased to be productive, and because of the power of discriminative knowledge, has turned back from the seven forms".(1) The *advaita vedānta* holds that the Absolute is the only reality and both the individual soul and the world are mere appearances of *Brahman*. So, in a liberated state, there is the realisation of this unqualified "unity" and the consequent falsification of the world and of individuality. But according to the Sāmkhya, both *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* are eternally real. What is false is their seeming identity. If this sense of identity is transcended, the *Purusa* attains liberation; and such liberation can be brought about by right knowledge or wisdom which is also a *dharma* of *buddhi*. Hence, the plain of *buddhi* is to be transcended with the help of *buddhi* alone, which is a modification of the ultimately real Nature.

The *Sāmkhya sūtram* recognises two kinds of *Mukti*, *Jīvanmukti* and *Videha mukti*. *Jīvanmukti* refers to the emancipation of a soul, while he is still living in the mind-body encasement. After death, the liberated self attains what is called *videha mukti*. This, in the opinion of Bhikṣu, is the real form of relief as in this condition only, there can be complete separation of mind, and body, and the consequent destruction of all physical and mental ills.(2) But this state of release is not a state of *ānanda* (bliss) as described by the *advaitins*. It is simply a state in which there is the complete destruction of the threefold misery of human life. The total annihilation of misery and not the realisation of any blissful condition is the supreme goal, according to this school of philosophy. This supreme goal is reached by the soul when the delusion, under which puruṣa thinks that the evolutes of Prakṛti are its own production, is completely shattered and the absolute freedom from pain is fully attained.

1. Sāmkhya Kārikā-65.
2. The Sāmkhya Pravacana-bhāsya Chapt. III—84.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Re-capitulation :

From the above discussion, it is clear that the Sāmkhya teaching of the classical school seems to lead us to the discrimination of spirit from Nature, the two ultimate principles of radically distinct character. *Prakṛti* is accepted as the fundamental matrix of the world which evolves the universe out of itself and also re-absorbs it at the time of dissolution. This *Prakṛti* is active and ever-changing but blind and unconscious. In the unevolved state, Nature is an equilibrium of the three *guṇas—sattva ,rajas* and *tamas*. When these three *guṇas* are thrown out of balance by the transcendental influence of the *Puruṣa*, evolution of the *mahat* and other categories proceeds. What then is the *Puruṣa*? The *Sāmkhya* answer is that "Puruṣa" is the permanent changeless and pure consciousness, and that its two purposes "enjoyment" and "liberation" are served by the evolutionary function of Nature. But this function is not performed by *Prakṛti* knowingly and intelligently. The teleology that is inherent in the *guṇa* reals is an unconscious one in the sense that the guṇas are driven to activity simply by an impulse of serving the purpose of the spiritual principle. Hence, there are not merely changes and transformations in the world. There is also the permanent principle of consciousness which manifests all these changing events of life and experience. The spirit does not control the process of creation directly by any real contact. The mere proximity (Sannidhi) of Puruṣa is sufficient to disturb the equilibrium and cause transformation and evolution.

Puruṣa wrongly identifies itself with the intellect, individuation mind, sense organs etc., (through reflection) for reason of which it mistakenly suffers all the miseries that really belong to the mind-body system. The only way of liberation is to know the nature of the evolved, the unevolved and their difference from the spirit. Hence release can be brought about by wisdom or knowledge, and for this purpose the grace of God is not needed. Such divine influence is also not necessary for explaining the creation and dissolution of this universe. So, the classical *Sāmkhya* does not make any attempt to prove the existence of *Iśvara* or God. On the contrary, it holds that such proof is not available. Hence, the classical *Sāmkhya* may be regarded as holding an atheistic and dualistic

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

position, while giving valuable assistance to suffering humanity in its aspiration to realise the supreme end of life i.e. liberation.

But such rigid and indissoluble dualism and atheism so important and prominent in the *Sāmkhya Kārikā* are not traceable in the *upaniṣada*, although the germs of the dualistic teachings of the *Sāmkhya* are abundantly present in the whole *upaniṣadic* literature. As the main purpose of this paper is to trace how the *Sāmkhya* system gradually developed into the classical form, our study of the early history of this school will start with the upaniṣadic conception of the philosophy of Sāmkhya which is theistic and monistic in nature.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

2nd CHAPTER

Sāmkhya in the Upaniṣads:

Although the principles of the *Samkhya* in their details are not to be found in the *Upaniṣads*, yet the presence of *Sāmkhya*-ideas in germinal forms in the *Upaniṣads* is an undisputed fact. Of course the main theme of all the *Upaniṣads* is both idealistic and monistic, as each one of them seeks to establish the supremacy of one infinite spirit; but there are passages here and there, indicating the growth of ideas which were knitted into systematic form in the philosophy of *Sāmkhya*. The *Sāmkhya* philosophy advocates the existence of dual principles of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and this dualistic tendency is not totally absent in the *Upaniṣads*. The leading *upaniṣadic* conceptions, however, are not in favour of establishing dualism as final and ultimate. So, though spirit and matter, *ātman* and *prakṛti* are admitted in many places, still the main tendency of the *upaniṣadic* literature always flows in the direction of monism or absolutism and not in the direction of rigid dualism or pluralism.

Dualistic ideas in the Upaniṣads:

In the *Bṛhad Upaniṣad* we come across the following passage: "Thus he did not at all feel delight. Therefore, every body when alone, does not feel delight. He was desirous of a mate. He became of the size of a man and wife embracing each other. He divided this very body into two. From that husband and wife came into existence. Therefore, this body is one half of himself, just as a split seed is of the whole; so said *Yājñavalkhya*. Hence this void is completed by the wife. He united with her. From that men were born."(1)

This passage clearly indicates that for the creation of *prajā* (off-springs) dual principles of opposite character are absolutely necessary. Perhaps, it will not be improper to maintain that this duality which makes its appearance in the Bṛhad Upa. develops afterwards with full vigour and strength into the dualism of *puruṣa*

1. Bṛhad. Upanisad-1. 4. 3.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

and *Prakṛti*. In the Bṛhad Upa., however, the *atman* is declared as originally one. The female entity springs forth from his own self and is not, therefore, absolutely independent of the *atman*. Hence, although here we get two principles, yet these two are the distinguishable parts of one whole, an opinion which is different from that of the *Sāmkhya Kārikā* in respect of its monistic outlook.

In the *prasna upaniṣad* too, we get an example of such dualism. Here, in this *upaniṣad*, it has been stated that *Prajāpati* first of all created two principles *Rayi* and *Prāna*, and these two then became united and created many *prajā*.(1) This dualism, however, is not ultimate. The supreme being is one and not two, although duality is openly admitted in a secondary sense.

The Transcendental Puruṣa:

With regard to *puruṣa*, however, the *upaniṣads* hold a view some what similar to that of the *Sāmkhya*. In the Bṛahadāraṇyaka Upanisad *puruṣa* is declared to be only a seer, not a doer, devoid of activity inasmuch as it is without association with anythng. "After enjoying and wandering about in dream and seeing the results of good and evil, that entity remains in the state of deep sleep, and proceeds again in a reverse process just to its former state, the dream. It is untouched by whatever it sees in that state, for this infinite entity is non-attached."(2)

In the Muṇdaka *Upaniṣad*, Brahman is declared as invisible unacceptable (*adreśyam* and *agrāhyam*) etc. (3) This is equivalent to saying that Brahman is something that cannot be experienced by means of our sense organs. In other words, Brahman is beyond the reach of our empirical knowledge. The *Katha Upaniṣad* also describes the Supreme spirit as soundless, touchless, colourless, tasteless and smell-less.(4) This again is equivalent to saying that these sense organs, which are the principal weapons of knowledge in the empirical sphere, fail to give us any knowledge of the Supreme spirit which is without sense qualities and is, therefore, transcendental. *Purusa* in the Samkhya is always interpreted as a transcendental principle endowed with super sensuous characteristics.

1. Praśna Upa. I—1.
2. Bṛhad. Upa. 4. 3. 15.
3. Muṇdaka-1. 6.
4. Katha-1. 3. 15.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Reality of the Supreme Trānscendentāl Self:

The Upaniṣads, however, again and again declare that "Self" alone is real and that all things and beings merge in the self which is the infinite source of the whole universe. "As the sea is the one merging place of all sorts of water, as the skin is the one merging place of all kinds of touch, as the nostrils are the one merging place of all odours, as the tongue is the one merging place of all savours, as the eye is the one merging place of all colours, as the ear is the one merging place of all sounds, as the mind is the one merging place of all deliberations, as the intellect is the one merging place of all kinds of knowledge, as the hands are the one merging place of all actions, as the organ of generation is the one merging place of all excretions, as the feet are the one merging place of all kinds of walking, as the organ of speech is the one merging place of all Vedas..(1)

"This is true, as from a blazing fire, sparks being like unto fire fly forth a thousand fold, thus are various beings produced from the imperishable and return therein.... That which is brilliant, smaller than the small, that on which the worlds and their inhabitants are grounded that this immortal, Brahman, that speech and manas,— that is this real, this immortal, that is to be achieved. O friend know".(2)

(Eng. Trans. from Yoga Philosophy in relation to other systems of Indian Thought by Prof. S. N. Das Gupta).

The examples, given above, are illustrative of the fact that the Universe is nothing but Brahman. Not only before and at the time of its creation and during its continuance, but also at the time of *pralaya* (dissolution) and after, the Universe is nothing but the Absolute. This is, no doubt, the stand of the *advaita vedānta* which sees Brahman in everything and on that ground refuses to give any substantive status to the Universe. Sāmkara, for instance, says in his *bhāṣya* on *Mundaka* 2. 1. 1. that Brahman alone is absolutely true and real and that all things and beings of this universe are

1. Brhad. Upa. 2. 4. 11.
2. Muṇd. II—I—I & II—2-2.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

appearances of the Absolute through limiting adjuncts. When these *Upādhis* will be removed, all will be totally dissolved into Brahman.

The Objective World:

Although these passages seem to refer to the fact that the central theory of the *upaniṣads* is not pure dualism, still, there are other passages too, which will show that the universe is not supposed to be as illusory and unreal as the unqualified monist intends to assume. Various things and beings of the world are produced from the imperishable and return therein....but does it mean that these things and beings are not true ? The following upaniṣadic passages, on the contrary, will indicate that the *upaniaṣds* seek to affirm the truth of the universe by tracing its origin to a real and changeless entity. "He desired may I be many, may I procreate myself, He performed penance and having performed penance he projected all this whatever there is. Having brought it forth he entered into his creation and having entered, became he sat and tyat, defined and undefined, the supported and the unsupported, conscious and unconscious, real and unreal. He became all this whatsoever,and therefore, the sages declare that all this is true and real."(1)

"Name and form are the true and by them this "prāṇa" is covered." (2).

Brahman possesses only two forms, the material and the immaterial, the mortal and the immortal, the limited and the unlimited, the manifest and the unmanifest.(3)

"From that very Ātman, ether was produced, from ether air, from air fire, from fire water, from water the earth, from the earth, plants, from plants food, and from the food, the living beings were brought into existence.(4)

"From food, all creatures are truly born; having been born, they are nourished by food, food is called "Annam" because all living beings both consume it and are consumed by it."(5)

---

1. Taitt. (2-6).
2. Brahad. Upa. 1. 6. 3.
3. Brhad Upa. 2. 3. 1 .
4. Taitt. Upa. 2-1.
5. Taitt. Upa. 2,2

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

"Through the energy of will Brahman swells and the material universe—"annam" comes into being."(1)

"This cosmic being is food." (2)

It is evident from all these that the material world is also true and real as it has originated from Brahman or is a form of Brahman. All organisms are produced from food (matter), they subsist on it and are dissolved into it after the period of life. Nature is the first thing that strikes our mind and we consider matter as the basis and stuff of our environment. This matter is called "annam" in the *upaniṣads* and the *upaniṣadic* thinkers with their idealistic and monistic outlook advise us to reflect on "Matter" as Brahman. Now, these passages in which our every day world is spoken of as real and true, lend support to the Sāmkhya conception of Prakṛti which like "Annam" is regarded as the basis of the entire Universe. The Muṇdaka Upaniṣad says, while describing the creation of the universe

(Tapasā cīyate brahma tatonnam abhijāyate,
Annāt praṇo manaḥ satyam lokāḥ karmasu cā-mṛtam)

Here for "annam", the word Prakṛti may suitably be substituted and everything may as well be supposed to have originated from Nature. But this Prakṛti or "Annam" in the Upaniṣads, is not an independent principle; it is a form of Brahman or it has sprung up from Brahman which alone is the ultimte reality. Therefore, the ultimate basis of the universe is not "matter", as is stated in the classical Sāmkhya which attempts at establishing non-dissoluble dualism.

The Concept of Self : *Individual Soul and the Supreme and Transcendental Spirit*:

Again, the division of the Ātman into *parameśvara* or *paramātman* and *jīva* in the Upaniṣads has also helped a dualistic and atheistic system like the classical Sāmkhya to grow and flourish. In the Chand. Upaniṣad(3) we meet with the word 'Jīvātman' which later denotes the individual soul as contrasted with the supreme.

1. Muṇdaka Upanisad 1. 1. 8.
2. Praśna Upanisad-1-14.
3. Chand. Upa. 6. 3. 2.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, similar idea is expressed in the line, "Brahman created the universe and then as soul entered into it". The Bṛhad Upaniṣad also says that the ātman alone exists and that it is the knowing subject in us. As such, it sustains the whole universe. The ātman is everything and beyond it is nothing and with the knowledge of the ātman all is known. In the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad it has been stated that two birds live in the close contact on the same tree; one of them eats sweet fruits but the other only sees the action.(1) Sāmkara interprets these two birds as jīva and parameśvara. While jīva experiences pleasures and pains, parameśvara remains entirely inactive and passive.

All these statements emphasise the importance of the individual souls as active agents and at the same time minimise the importance of the conception of God as the prime mover and sustainer of the universe, jīva alone knows the world, jīva supports the world and jīva experiences pleasures and pains of the world due to "Aviveka" and in accordance with the law of Karma. Hence, it is no wonder that in course of time in a dualistic system like the classical Sāmkhya, God was totally abandoned. In the upaniṣads, we also get the idea that the primitive matter, though a product from the absolute, exists before the living beings or jīvātmans enter into the sphere of existence. "From that very ātman, ākāśa was produced, from ākāśa air, from air, fire, from fire, water, from water, the earth, from the earth, herbs, from herbs, food and from food, the living beings are produced.(2) Hence, nature (constituted of matter) becomes entirely independent of jīvātman and by eliminating the idea of the supreme spirit as the highest controlling authority, the classical sāmkhya gets prakṛti as an eternally independent principle, besides puruṣa or soul; and these two, then become the dual principles or the minimum metaphysical suppositions for the explanation of life and the universe. The upaniṣads have already accepted matters as the basis of the universe. The classical Sāmkhya system only goes a step further and transfers creativity to such material principle which is conceived of as absolutely independent and uncaused. Of course, this transition from the monistic conception of the upanisads to the dualistic hypothesis of the Sāmkhya Kārikā is not a short

1. Svetāśvatara Upa. 4. 6.
2. Taitt. Up. 2-1.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

and direct one. Upaniṣadic Sāmkhya has undergone many changes and transformations before adopting the Kārikā form. All these will be discussed as intermediate forms between the upaniṣadic Sāmkhya and the classical one in the main body of this work.

Categories of the Sāmkhya:

Further material for the origin of the series of evolution is also to be found in the upaniṣads. In the Katha Upaniṣad, it has been stated that the objects are higher than the senses, mind, than the objects, the intellect than mind, the great self than intellect, the undeveloped than the great self and the spirit than the undeveloped. (1)

(Eng. Trans. from "The Sāmkhya system" by A.B. Keith)

In another passage, of the same upaniṣad a similar account is given. Here, the mind is supposed to be beyond the senses, Sattva (intellect) beyond the mind, beyond that the great self, higher than that, the undeveloped, beyond that the spirit which is all pervading and without any distinctive mark.(2)

Here the categories are as follows—

Objects, senses, mind, intellect, the great self, undeveloped and the spirit. In the classical Sāmkhya too we get as categories, the objects, the senses, the mind, the intellect, the undeveloped and the spirit as the 25th principle.

Distinction between the great self and buddhi:

Mahān Ātmā (Great Self) which appears as a category is not to be found in the classical Sāmkhya. In the Sāmkhya, the place of this has been taken up by mahat or buddhi, although in respect of function, there is not much difference between the great self and the buddhi. Both are regarded as "germs" of the world. The substitution of the buddhi for the great self is an easy affair for the classical Sāmkhya, because it needs no self for creating the cosmic world. But the upaniṣadic thinkers have generally accepted some spiritual principle as the creator, and this creator Brahman is spoken of as prajāpati, Hiraṇyagarbha, Mahānātmā and so on. The Mahānātmā is related to the spirit through avyakta, and the all

1. Katha. Upa. 1-3-20-11.
2. Katha Upa. 2. 3. 7 & 8.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

pervading spirit (Puruṣa) does not seem to be absolutely detached from the avyakta and other categories. It stands in one line with all these categories and thereby suggests the idea that it is the highest development of the Avyakta-Prakṛti which is not separable from it (being the lower phase of puruṣa). In the Sāmkhya of the Gītā, Prakṛti has been described as the lower nature of God and this conception of Nature either as a part or as power of the supreme spirit is the dominating view in all forms of theistic Sāmkhya.

The Concept of Tanmātras:

Again, in the fourth praśna of the Praśna Upaniṣad it is explained that in dreaming, the senses enter into mind and in deep sleep mind also enters into *tejas*. Then follows an account of how all things are absorbed in the imperishable,—the order being the five elements, each with its corresponding mātrā, the five organs of perception with their functions, the five organs of action with their functions, the mind, intellect ahamkāra, thought, citta, brilliance and breath and their functions.(1) In this account we meet with many terms which have been freely used in the classical Sāmkhya. Mātrā, here, may reasonably be accepted as referring to tanmātrā—a term explicitly given, first of all, in the Maitrāyani Upaniṣad.(2)

Further Evolution:

Further light is thrown on the evolutionary position by the Muṇdaka upaniṣad. The steps of evolution in the classical Sāmkhya can very well be compared with the steps of the evolution of things from the *primeval* essence, as they appear in the Muṇdaka upaniṣad.

Muṇdaka (1. 1. 8)	Muṇdaka 2. 1. 2 & 3	Classical Sāmkhya
Brahman	Puruṣa (Aksaram)	Prakṛti
Annam	Prāṇa	Mahat
Prāṇa	Manas, sense organs the elments	Ahamkāra
Manas, Satya, Lokāh, Karmani		Mind, sense, organs of action Tanmātras and Mahābhūtas

1. Praśna-4-8.
2. Maitrāyani Upanisad-3. 2.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Anna (Food) becomes Prakṛti and *Prāna* becomes *mahat* and other categories like *tanmatras*, *ahamkara* etc. are added to the evolutionary series of the later Sāmkhya. Brahman gradually ceases to exist as the first cause of the Universe, as we see in the classical Sāmkhya.

A much more developed account of the Sāmkhya type is to be found in the *Śvetā-śvataropaniṣad* which is commonly known as the Sāmkhya upaniṣad, as it contains in a nabulous form many important principles of the Sāmkhya school. Thus in the Śveta Upa. 1.4 the Ātman is probably compared to an one fellied wheel with three tyres, sixteen ends, fifty spokes, twenty counterspokes and six sets of eight, which is driven along three different roads by means of a belt that is single yet manifold.(1) The three tyres may be said to represent the three guṇas of Prakṛti with which the supreme spirit remains covered, 16 ends may stand for sixteen *vikāras*. Fifty spokes may refer to the five *viparyayas*, 28 *aśaktis*, 9 tuṣtis and 8 *siddhis*. Twenty counter spokes may be said to refer to the ten senses and their ten objects. *Aṣṭakas* or six sets, each consisting of 8 entities, may be enumerated as follows:

(1) Eight fold Nature, 8 ingredients of the body, 8 psychic powers, 8 mental states, 8 super human beings, 8 virtues of the soul. Three different roads stand for virtue, vice and knowledge. According to Śamkara's interpretaion, Paramātman is here symbolised as the one fellied wheel with three tyres and the universe is an expression of this Supreme Being:

(Yaḥ eka kāraṇāni nikhilani adhitiṣṭhati, tamekanemim)

But his interpretation leans towards the establishment of the Brahman as one Reality without a second, which appears to our intellect in the form of this universe (i.e. advaita doctrine). It will not be unreasonable, if we say that this mantra is essentially Sāmkhya in the sense that it gives us a detailed account of the enumeration, most of which are accepted in the Sāmkhya Kārikā of Isvarakṛṣṇa. Nature, (the material cause of the universe) is represented here by the circumference of the wheel and it is not an independent principle. It remains inseparably united with the ātman

1. Śvetāśvatara Upa. 1. 4.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

(wheel) along with all its effects and products, suggesting thereby a monistic setting for the upaniṣadic Sāmkhya.

Again according to the classical Sāmkhya, contact (Samyoga) between puruṣa and prakṛti creates disturbance in the equilibrium of the three guṇas and then evolution proceeds. The Śvatāśvatropaniṣad also says that the Supreme spirit gives the start to the creation associated with the three guṇas of Nature and orders all things.(1)

The evolution of Prakṛti in conjunction with the puruṣa is described also in the Maitrāyani upaniṣad. "It has also been said elsewhere that which acts is the elemental self but that which causes to act by the organs is the Internal soul. As a ball of iron, informed by fire and hammered by the workman becomes manifold, so too this elemental soul, informed by the Internal and hammered by the Guṇas (Rajas and Tamas) becomes manifold."(2) (Eng. Trans. E.B. Cowell)

The Theory of the Guṇas:

The most important topic of the Sāmkhya system is the doctrine of the gunas which depends upon the thought that the three forces that are active in the psychical organism as *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, are present in Nature and form its substance. This doctrine appears in its full form in the Śvetāśvatara upaniṣad in which we get the following passage: "There is an unborn single female of red, white and black colours who creates many offsprings resembling herself. An unborn male lies beside her out of attachment for her, while another male, also unborn, leaves her after having enjoyed her.(3)

Here, the female referred to may be admitted as Prakṛti for Nature and the three colours may indicate the three guṇas or constituents of Prakṛti, known as *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, (4) (although these terms are not given in this *sruti*). Numerous offsprings may be said to refer to the various objects of creation. All objects of nature, according to the Sāmkhya, are made of the 3 guṇas and

1. Svetāśvatara Upa. 6.4.
2. Maitrāyani-3. 3.
3. Svetasvatara Upa. 4-5.
4. This is the sense in which this passage has been interpreted by Śaṁkara in his Brahma sūtra Bhāsya (Adhyāya 2-8) Ajāmekam etc. (Sveta 4-5).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

therefore they are said to resemble Nature which is nothing but the 3 guṇas. Two unborn males may be said to refer to the attached and the non-attached puruṣas. One puruṣa is in bondage and therefore enjoys the fruits of his actions, while the other puruṣa has freed himself from the bonds of Prakṛti and therefore, from the experiences of pleasures and pains.

That this verse expresses the fundamental thought of the Sāmkhya system is not open to question. The manifold relations of the many puruṣas to Prakṛti have been effectively illustrated by the relations of two unborn males,"—one attached and the other non-attached. (Herein lie the germs of a full fledged theory of vahu-puruṣa-vāda.) (According to Śamkara, however, the unborn female is not the *avyakta* Prakrti of the Sāmkhya system, but it is Māyā or the formative principle and condition of God from whom it is not separate.) The three colours mentioned in the Chānd. Upaniṣad as those of the 3 elements,—fire, water and earth—are also produced from the absolute and are present in all that exists. The Sāmkhya conception of the all pervading character of the guṇas, which in different proportions are present in all the products of nature, is as well suited to the description of the progeny of the female as this view of the Chānd. Upaniṣad.(1) So, we may safely say with Mr. Keith that we have a clear hint of the origin of the doctrine of the guṇas in the three fold material of the Chānd. Upaniṣad; and this passage also unfolds to us the elemental character of the three guṇas, since all the things of the universe are composed of them. The names of sattva, rajas and tamas, however, do not occur until the Maitrāyani upaniṣad in which we get a more developed account of the Sāmkhya system, "Verily this was at the first Tamas alone, it resided in the supreme; then being set in motion by the Supreme, it becomes uneven and unequal. This condition becomes rajas, this rajas being set in motion, passes into in-equality. This becomes the condition of Sattva. This Sattva alone is then set in motion, and flavour flows forth.(2) (Eng. Trans. E.B. Cowell)

Both the Chānd and the Śvetāśvatara upaniṣads mention the three guṇas as red, white and black. The red is rajas, because it

1. Chānd 6-4.
2. Maitrāyani 5.2.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

naturally makes red, the white is Sattva because it naturally makes bright, the black is tamas because it naturally darkens. The different kinds of mental qualities are classified in the Maitrāyani upaniṣad, according as they are due to the predominance of different guṇas in living beings. Confusion, fear, drowsiness, sleep, sloth, etc. are due to the predominance of the *tamoguṇa*, whereas thirst, fondness, love, hatred, jealousy, etc. are the effects of the raja guṇa, Pleasure and happiness, on the other hand, result from the predominance of the Sattva guṇa in living beings.(1) The guṇas are also spoken of in various places of the Śvetāśvatara upaniṣad. The following passages may be cited as examples:

"Ārabhya karmāṇi guṇān-vitāni" 6.4.
"Gunānvayo yaḥ phalakarmakartā" 5.7.
"Gunāmca sarvān viniyogaed yaḥ".

Separate Existence of the Puruṣa:

In all these places, *puruṣa* is distinguished from the *guṇas* as being absolutely separate, though falsely associated with them. This is also the view of the *Sāmkhya* according to which *puruṣa* in false association with the *guṇas*, performs actions and also enjoys the fruits of those action.

The *Maitrāyani upaniṣad*, which is comparatively recent, gives us a more developed and elaborate account of the *Sāmkhya* system. *Puruṣa* is here described as the mere enjoyer, and not as the creator of the universe. "This is thus the pure changeless unmoving undefilable disinterested *puruṣa* that abides in itself as the mere seer. Having ensnared itself in the web of the *guṇas*, it appears as the enjoyer. (2) Two kinds of selves are spoken of, the pure and the phenomenal. The phenomenal self is overcome by the five *tanmātras* and the five *mahābhūtas*. But this phenomenal self is not absolutely different from the pure self. It is the pure self, which being bewildered, appears as the phenomenal self and suffers. That which controls the body is called the phenomenal self. Its immortal nature always remains unaffected by desires and passions like a drop of water on the lotus leaf. Still, it appears to

1. Maitrayani Upanisad 6-10 & 3, 5.
2. Maitrāyani Upanisad-2. 7.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

be assailed by the *guṇas* of nature, through ignorance. In this state of utter bewilderment, it fails to see the lord who is the true cause of action. Having veiled itself in the web of the *guṇas*, the phenomenal self forgets its true nature; and being tormented by desires, unsteadiness, egoism, eagerness etc., it suffers all sorts of misery and pain.(1) There is also another passage in which the soul is described as the enjoyer and Nature as its food. The thinking *puruṣa*, that resides in *prakṛti* is really the enjoyer, while its food is supplied to it by Nature. The food consists of the three *guṇas*; the spirit, abiding within, is the enjoyer. The self is the enjoyer and Nature is that which is enjoyed. It enjoys residing therein.(2)

Elucidation of the Ideas of the Highest or Transcendental Self, the Phenomenal Self and also of Intelligisation of the Buddhi by the Consciousness of Self:

The highest self, the phenomenal self and the *guṇas* are compared with the glow, the iron and the smith who hammers only the iron and not the glow pervading it. The highest soul is beyond the influence of all the activities of the *guṇa*, although it spreads its light on them. The phenomenal self, which like the red hot iron catches the reflection of the highest soul, plunges in the vortex of this worldly life and enjoys pleasures and pains. In other words, the highest self is free from sin, free from old age, from death and misery, hunger and thirst, but the phenomenal self by remaining bound in the shackles of the three guṇas, is constantly affected by all physical and mental changes. Again the *Sāmkhya* holds that the *buddhi*, which is a psychical organ in man, is by nature, as unintelligent as any one of the physical organs; but it appears as intelligent with the reffected light of *puruṣa*. A similar idea, we find, in the *Maitrāyani upaniṣad*, when it says, "By him—the intelligent, is this body made to appear intelligent."(3) The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad* has also held the view that the intellect easily reflects the consciousness of the self, because it is transparent and next to the self. Derivative nature of consciousness in a living organism is, therefore, not an entirely new conception in the *Sāmkhya* philosophy.

1. Maitrayani Upanisad 3.2
2. Maitrāyani Upa. VI—10.
3. Muitrāyani Upa. 2.5.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The Sāmkhya theory of Causation:

The *Sāmkhya* theory of causation too can be found in a less developed form in the *upaniṣads*. The dialogue between *Uddālaka* and *Śvetaketu* in the 6th chapter of the *Chand. Upaniṣad* gives us a clear exposition of the thory of *satkāryavāda*. *Uddālaka*, for the purpose of instructing *Śvetaketu*, says, "If you know the nature of a lump of of clay, you will be able to understand the nature of all things which are made of clay; if you know the nature of gold, you will be able to understand the nature of all golden things. So, do try to know the root cause of this universe, because by knowing the cause you will be able to know the effect." This is the theory of *Satkārya-vāda*, according to which the cause and the effect are identical in essence. The effect is nothing but the cause transformed. Milk and curd differ in names and forms only; but so far as their *upādāna* (matter) is concerned, there is perfect identity. Names and forms possess practical utility or empirical validity only because they are of great help to human beings in their practical life. But metaphysically considered, names and forms are mere words, the real thing is the cause. In the *Muṇdaka upaniṣad* we get mantras(1) in support of the theory of *pariṇāma vāda* (the thoery of real causal transformation). The world is said to spring forth from *Brahman* (and also return to it) like the web of a spider, like the plants growing out of the earth, like hairs growing out of a human body, etc. The world, therefore, appears to be the real effect, a real transformation,—just as the web of the spider is a real creation and not a mere appearance like the illusion of the snake in a rope. Something in the spider does get really transformed into threads (i.e. the effect). The similies given in the previously mentioned *mantra* of the *Muṇdaka upaniṣad* suggest plainly that the emanations that arise out of *Brahman* are real evolutionary products and not mere illusory appearances.

Findings in the Upaniṣads:

From the above discussion, it becomes evident that germs of many important *sāṅkhya* ideas can easily be discovered in the *upaniṣads* although in an unbundled and scattered condition. The *Sāmkhya*

1. Muṇdaka Upa. 1. 1. 7.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

conception of *Prakṛti* as constituted of the three *guṇas*, *guṇas* as the stuff of all things and beings of the universe, the *Sāmkhya* conception of "*Samyoga*" between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* for the start of the evolutionary series, creation of the universe by evolution, plurality of selves etc., have actually been discussed in various *upanisads*. The *Sāmkhya* conception of *Prakṛti* as an indeterminate homogeneous entity is also rooted in the *upaniṣads* which often describe the ultimate reality as an indeterminate being or '*asat*'. (1) But "matter" has never been mentioned in the *upaniṣads* as an independent principle. As a general remark, therefore, it may be pointed out that the *upanisads* do not recognize the existence of spirit as 'individual only.' The existence of the supreme spirit is always admitted and both the individual soul and matter are regarded as modes of this supreme spirit. This supreme spirit is beyond sense experience,(2) is conceived of as existing here and there, in the phenomena as well as noumena. It is the basis of the outer as well as the inner order. It controls the physical forces and also forms their very substratum. This supreme spirit is without touch, with form,without taste, without smell, eternal, infinite, beginningless, higher than the *mahat*.

The third section of the second chap. of the *Bṛhad. upaniṣad*, which describes the two forms of the supreme self, means to suggest that by super-imposing these two forms, *Brahman* is made conceivable. The same *upaniṣad* also holds that as from a fire, little sparks scatter, just so from the supreme self emanate all organs, all worlds, all gods and all beings. This supreme self is spoken of in the following *mantra* of the *praśna upaniṣad* as well:—

Vijñānātmā saha devaisca sarvaiḥ
Prāṇābhūtāni supratiṣṭhanti yatra
Tadakṣaram vedyate yastu saumya
Sa sarvajñaḥ sarvam eva āviveśa(3)

Even the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* and the *Maitrāyani upaniṣad* (which in a sense may be regarded as the *Sāmkhya upaniṣad*) do not advocate

1. Tuitt. Upa. 2.7.
2. (a) Katha Upa. 1. 3. 15.
   (b) Brhad. Upa. 3. 8. 8.
3. Praśna Upanisad (4. 11).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

final dualism or atheism. The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*, upholding unity as ultimate, says: "It is the self same one who exists alone at the time of creation and dissolution of the universe, that assumes manifold powers and appears as the Divine Lord by virtue of His inscrupable power of *Māyā*. He it is that protects all the world and controls all the various forces working therein. Those who realise this Being become immortal.(1) (*E*ng. Trans. Swāmi Tyāgīśānanda, Rāmkṛṣṇa Math).

This *mantra* speaks of the oneness of the ultimate principle and also shows how the Divine Lord is nothing but this ultimate principle, appearing as active in creation, maintenance and destruction of the universe by virtue of the power of *Māyā* which belongs to Him.

In the *Maitrāyani upaniṣad*, the unmanifested is described as the "mouth of the spirit" which enjoys the three *guṇas*." (2) Hence, *Prakṛti* or the unmanifested is not an independent entity. While discussing about the concentration of the mind, this *upaniṣad* says that "he who beholds the golden coloured, the doer, the lord, the spirit, *Brahman*, the cause, abondons his merits and sins and reduces everything to unity in the supreme in-destructive soul.(3) (Eng. Trans. E.B. Cowell)

Hence, we find that the *Sāmkhya* concepts and ideas in the *Upaniṣads* develop in an environment of theism or absolutism. *Prakṛti* or matter has been given only a secondary place as it is always subordinated to a supreme spirit which is spoken of as *Brahman*, *Maheśvara*, *ātman*, *puruṣa* etc. The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*, indeed, contains a more developed account of the *Sāmkhya* system, but here, also we find that the *Sāmkhya* elements are subordinated to its main doctrine of theism.

"Know then that Nature is *Māyā* and that *Maheśwara* is the Controller of *Māyā*. The whole world is filled with beings who form his parts." (4) (Eng. Trans. Swāmi Tyāgīsānanda)

---

1. Sveta. Upa. 3. 1.
2. Maitrāyani Upa. 6. 10.
3. Ibid 6. 18.
4. Svet. Upa. 4. 10.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

"One attains endless peace on realising that self-effulgent Adorable Lord, the bestower of blessings, who though one, rules over all the various aspects of *Prakṛti* and in whom this universe merges and in whom it appears in diverse form."(1) (Eng. Trans. Swāmi Tyāgīsānanda)

"May he, who created the gods and supports them, who witnessed the birth of the cosmic soul, who confers bliss and wisdom on the devoted, destroying their sins and sorrows and punishing all breaches of law, may He, the great seer and the lord of all, endow us with good thoughts."(2) (Eng. Trans Swāmi Tyāgīsānanda).

Thus, the *upaniṣads* contain elements of monism and dualism, realism and idealism with their different shades and colours. The *Sāmkhya* philosophy takes up the dualistic and realistic elements and the gradual strengthening of emphasis on these aspects in different ages, and in the hands of different teachers, at last, has resulted in the formulation of the classical *Sāmkhya* of *Isvarakṛṣṇa* and his followers. Hence the philosophy of the *Sāmkhya* school lays no less claim on the teachings of the *upaniṣads* than the *vedānta* of the *Śamkara* School.

1. Sveta. Upa. 4. 11.
2. Ibid. 4. 12.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

3rd CHAPTER

Sāmkhya in the Mahābhārata:

Like the *Upaniṣads*, the *Mahābhārata* also contains within itself valuable suggestions, expositions and lucid analysis of *Sāmkhya* concepts which may suitably be knitted together for the development of a *Sāmkhya* stand. Of course, these ideas are so scattered and so diversely explained that the task of spinning out only one coherent system of thought is fraught with great risks. Both theistic and atheistic versions of the *Sāmkhya* system can be gathered from these materials, without much strain and twist. The most common view of the *Sāmkhya*, that has been frankly and openly admitted in several chapters of the "*Śānti Parva*" of the *Mahābhārata* is, however, theistic and monistic, although an atheistic tendency, too, represented by the teachings of *Pañcaśikha* boldly hovers round this theistic conception.

THEISTIC ACCOUNT

Puruṣa Prakṛti and the Puruṣottama:

The existence of a "*Puruṣottama*" (the highest spiritual being) as the ultimate Reality is too apparent in the *Mahābhārata*, and *puruṣa* (individual self) and *Prakṛti*, the spirituality and physico-mentality, are but phases of this highest Lord.

Prakṛti is, no doubt, endowed with the dynamic power of evolving and dissolving this lovely universe; but she does not, of her own accord, perform this wonderful function. She is fully under the influence of One Spiritual Principle, who is her Lord or Master, (Triguṇādhipa); and it is this Lord who makes her play with her own creative powers and energy. This spiritual principle is, therefore, the highest reality that transcends (1) and includes both *Prakṛti* (2) and individual *Puruṣa* (3). This is the principle of consciousness that illumines and supports everything. This is the '*boddha*' and

1. The Mahābhārata 50, 26, 27 (Śānti Parvan).
2. The Mahābhārata, Śānti Parvan, 303, 31-34.
3. Ibid 350-26-27.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the '*bodhaniya*', (*Jiva* and *Iśvara*), the thinker and the thought, the enjoyer and the enjoyed. The smeller and the smelt, one who touches, and the touched, the seer and the seen, the hearer and the heard, the knower and the known. In other words, it is the supreme principle of the whole universe because *pradhāna* which is is known as the source of *mahat* etc., is included in this eternal being.(1)

The highest principle has no rival or opponent. Whenever duality is spoken of, it refers in all contents to the duality between "*Sattva*" and "*Kṣetrjña*', (perceiving self) and not between the "*Puruṣottama*" and any other principle. Materiality and spirituality seem to become the lower and higher phases of the highest Being, and these two phases, though different in nature, are still in a beginningless association, since such a union is necessary for the creation and maintenance of this world. Nature is the dyanamic principle that brings into existence all things and beings of this world. The innumerable ripples and rythms of worldly life, its rugged rocks and green valleys, its pleasures and pains, flowers and thorns, all are due to this moving and palpitating power, often termed as Nature or *Prakṛti*. Pure individual consciousness that appears as the knower of this worldly existence is not an active principle. Thus, we gather from the valuable teachings of the *mahābhārata* the idea that nature creates everything, but it does so only under the control of the highest spiritual principle (2). The distinction of spirit as inactive and Nature as active is recognised in the great epic of India, but this duality is transcended in the final state of release when *Kseṭrajña*, the 25th principle, becomes emancipated from the clutches of the *guṇas* by its becoming one with the absolutely supreme spirit or the 26th principle, which is the final support of all.(3) In this state, the question of duality does not arise, as there is no other principle besides this supreme being.

The Kṣetra, the Kṣetrajña and their Duality:

Duality or distinction is to be maintained between the 24th categories of Nature and 25th principle, which is clearly and aptly

1. The Mahābhārata, (Śānti-Parva) 351-(17-18).
2. Ibid 314-12.
3. The Mahābhārata, (Śānti-Parva) 308 (9-13).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

spoken of as *kṣetrajña* or the perceiving consciousness. The 24th categories, including *avyakta*, constitute the physico-mental conglomeration known as the "*Kṣetra*" (field) and the individual soul, that reside inside this whole, is known as the *adhiṣṭhātā* or knower of the field. This is the principle that has been numbered as the 25th one. *Avyakta of Prakṛti* is also called "*Sattva*" or *Īśvara*,(1) since this is the source of all originations and creation. The 25th principle is different from Nature and its categories; but it is not the highest principle, as it has been distinctly stated in the *Mahābhārata* that this 25th principle or the *kṣetrajña* becomes united with the 26th principle-its source at the time of release or *Kaivalya*. (2) The *Kṣetrajña* has been taken by us to stand for the perceiving self or the living principle of self within the mind-body complex in the *Mahābhārata*, as there are reasons in favour of this contention. It has already been stated above that the 25th principle is called the *Kṣetrajña*, as it knows the *kṣetra*. In other words, the 25th principle has been identified with the *kṣetrajña*. It is in the state of bondage alone that the encased self (i.e. the 25th one) fails to realise its non-distinction from the 26th principle. It falsely boasts of its being the highest category through ignorance. But when it becomes the "*Kavali*", it perceives its unity with the 26th principle. *Nilkaṇṭha* too, while explaining the passage "*Kṣetrajñapi—Yada tata tat kṣetre sampralīyate*", has identified *kṣetrajna* with the 25th principle. If this principle attains "*Kaivalya*" and thereby becomes merged in the highest category, it cannot refer to any other being except the individual self within the mind-body system.

Of course, while discussing the points of distinction between *Sattva* and *Kṣetrajña*, it has been stated that *kṣetrajña* is without any support or substratum, but that would not be accepted as a justifiable ground for interpreting *kṣetrajña* as some divine personality other than so many witnessing selves, possessing different mind-body complexes. *Kṣetrajña*, being the principle of consciousness, is identical with the pure, stainless, supersensible consciousness which has been spoken of as the supreme *puruṣa*. It has been clearly stated in

1. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parvan) 306-41.
2. Ibid—307-16.
   (a) Ksetrajña' pi yadā tāta tat ksetre sampralīyate. (Tīkā-ksetrajan pancavaimsopi tatksetre svotpattisthane sadvimsesampraliyate.) Nilkaṇtha.
   (b) 308-11-12.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the *Mahābhārata* that just as one fire becomes many, one sun is the source of all light and the same air blows in different directions, in the same way one supreme self assumes the forms of so many selves, being focussed through different bodies.(1) Now, if this living principle of consciousness is nothing but a spark of the supreme self, getting entangled in the meshes, woven by *Prakṛti*, then there is no harm in characterising it as a self-reliant principle, which indeed it is, if viewed properly from a correct angle of vision. It is the universal consciousness, only limited by *antah-karaua* to a particular individual and, thus, individualised by it.

This perceiving self is in fact different from the mind-body complex with which it gets identified through ignorance. The epic transfers all activities to *Sattva* or Nature and makes the self entirely inactive. *Prakrti* is unconscious, but *kṣetrajña* is just the opposite. The self simply perceives whatever is produced by Nature or *Sattva*. Though radically distinct, yet these two principles are related together like fish and water, or fly and fig-leaf.(2) It is because of this relation and also under the spell of ignorance that the spirit identifies itself with nature and considers itself as the active and creative principle. The wants, appetites, desires and passions which really belong to *Antahkaraṇa*, are owned by the spirit as parts and parcels to itself. In other words, due to complete self-forgetfulness, the spirit becomes submerged in *Prakrti* and enjoys and suffers worldy pleasures and pains (i.e. Bondage). (3) It should, however, be mentioned here that in the course of this discussion, the word *Sattva* is taken in the sense of *Prakrti* and not in the sense of "*buddhi*", whenever it has been contrasted with the *kṣetrajña*. Of course, among the three gunas, it is *sattva*, in the *buddhi* that catches the reflection of pure consciousness and thereby creates the false impression of identity. Still, *buddhi*, being itself the result of permutation and combination of the three *guṇas* presupposes a previous existence of the three *guṇas* or *Prakṛti* in contact with the spirit. It is not the ultimate category although it is the first evolute from which all other categories have evolved. So, while, *Kṣetrajña* refers to the individual witnessing self," *Sattva* refers to the psycho-physical

1. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parva) 351-9-10.
2. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parvan) 194-39-40, 285-37; 285-34-34.
3. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parvan) 315-6.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

substrate or Prakṛti. Moreover, in chap. 306 of *Śānti Parva*, *Prakṛti* has actually been described as *Sattva*, (*Avyaktam kṣetramityuktam tathā sattvam tatheśvaraḥ*).

The Guṇas:

Prakṛti has been declared to consist of the three *guṇas*, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* and all objects of this world are spoken of as their products. These are also the three factors that act like coverings in relation to *puruṣa*, and due to the eixtence of these *guṇas*, the soul suffers delusion and misery. It is only by transcending all the *guṇas*, that one can attain liberation from the cycle of birth and death. But the *Mahābhārata* does not give us any clear and definite idea regardng the nature of these three *guṇas*. They are generally referred to as representing different mental states, good, bad and indifferent. Living beings are also divided on this ground into *sāttvika*, *rājasika* and *tāmasika*. Those who have predominance of *sattva* in them are born in a higher world, those who are under the influence of *rajas*, are born as man and those, who have a predominant element of *tamas*, are born as animals.

Buddhi or Intelligence Stuff:

Buddhi has been given a very prominent place in the epic philosophy, as it has been very clearly stated that the whole universe is shot through and through with the *buddhi* and that all materials, both merge and emerge from this very cosmic principle.(1)

The epic has often given us the doctrine of the development of the "*Bhautika* elements" of the universe from *Bhotatman* and *Bhūtākṛt*. In our opinion there is justifiable ground for accepting the term *Bhūtātman*, as standing for *buddhi*, the great germ of the whole world. If *Buddhi* is the main source from which the whole creation has sprung up, then, it is only just and reasonable to hold that the five elements have also originated from this single principle. *ātmā* in *bhūtātmā* does not seem to imply any spiritual entity like self or God. It refers to *buddhi*—the first category—without which the world could not have been brought into existence. Since, it is the main principle of creation, it has been described as the

1. The Mahābhārata (Śānti-Parvan) 194-17-18 (Tīkā) Nilkaṇṭha.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Ātma of all *bhūtas*. In chapter 285 of *Śānti Parva*, we come across the world *Bhūtakṛt* which, too, may justifiably be regarded as meaning the intelligence-stuff (i.e. the first born category of Nature).

But *buddhi* is not treated as the only source of these *bhautika* elements in the *Mahābhārata*. There are other suggestions too, which trace the development of the elements from the Absolute Being (1) or from the mind (2) although their commonly held source is *ahamkāra*.

The Categories:

In the epic philosophy, too, the various parts of the empirical world are derived from Nature; but on this point there prevails a number of views with marked variations among themselves. Thus, in one version, there are five senses, mind, intellect and spirit as *kṣetrajña*;(3) in another, the spirit is admitted as the ninth element; as "*chitta*" a new element has been added to the group.(4) In Chap. 306 of *Śānti Parva*, however, we find an enumeration of 8 *Prakṛtis*, together with five organs of sensation, the five of action, mind and the five objects, (16 *vikāras*).

These are almost similar to the categories enumerated in the classical *Sāmkhya*, the important difference being the omission of the term "*tanmātra*" in the philosophy of this great epic. Again, in chapter 310 it is stated that according to the *Sāmkhya* system, mahat first of all arises from Nature, from *mahat* arises *ahamkāra*, from *ahamkāra* originates the mind and from the mind the five elements come into being,(5) (although 8 *prakṛtis* and 16 *vikāras* are admitted in this context).

Empirical Plurality and Transcendental Unity of the Souls:

The souls, so long as they are in the union with nature, are many in number; but as soon as they realise their distinction from Nature, they abondon *Prakrti*. They then enter into the Supreme

1. Mahābhārata (Śānti Parvan) 207.
2. Ibid 310-18-19.
3. Ibid 246-17.
4. Mahābhārata Śānti Parvan 274-16, 18.
5. Ibid 310-16-19.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

spirit,—the final merging ground of all multiplicity and difference.(1) It has been repeatedly stated in the *Mahābhārata* that the individual *puruṣas* are many and that they can be relieved of their burden of sufferings by their abandonment of *Prakṛti* and its evolutes. This abandonment, of course, does not mean the annihilation of *Prakṛti*. It simply refers to the realisationby an individual *puruṣa* of his own nature, and the consequent transcendence of *Prakṛti* by him. In this state, therefore, he sees his difference from the psycho-physical *structure*, and Nature, too, fails to affect him in good or bad manner. (In this respect, there is similarity between the theistic view of the *Mahabharata* and the classical view.)

The Concept of Time:

Time occupies an important place in the epic. Individuals are born in different bodies, due to their accumulated merits and demerits, under the influence of time. Time, as a category, regulates and determines to a certain extent, the destiny of living beings. In the dialogue between *Asitadevala* and *Nārada* (*Śānti. Ch.* 274) eight kinds of *Bhūtās* are mentioned: *bhāva*, *abhāva*, *kāla*, *pṛthivī*, *apas*, *vyāyu*, *ākāśa* and *tejas*; and *kāla* is spoken of as that which being impelled by "*bhāva*", brings into existence all *bhūtas* out of the five elements, viz., earth, air, water, wind and light. The senses themselves are not the knowers, but produce knowledge for the *kṣetrajña*. Higher than the senses is *chitta*, superior to this is *manas*, higher than *manas* is *buddhi* and the highest of all is the spiritual principle.

Findings

From the above discussion, it is clear that the *Mahābhārata* gives us a more thorough exposition of the theistic *Sāmkhya* than what we gather from the study of the *upaniṣads*. The epic explains, in details, the distinction between *kṣetrajña* and Nature; and this perceiving self is set over against the 24 categories of *Prakṛti* constituting the sphere of empirical knowledge. This perceiving self or the transcendental ego is not the real doer and enjoyer. It is simply the pure and spectator like consciousness that forms the background

1. (a) The Mahābhārata, 350-26 (Śānti Parva).
   (b) Ibid (351).
   (c) Ibid (308).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

of our empirical existence. In the epic philosophy, this transcendental ego has, no doubt, been regarded as different from the psycho-physical organism, but in order to avoid dualism and atheism, both of them are made to hang on the 26th principle which is the final abode of the whole creation. Here, the influence of the *upaniṣadic* doctrine is clearly visible, as the *upaniṣads* also make *jīvātman* (individual soul) independent of Nature only, while maintaining all through the view that both of them are rooted in the *Brahman*. It is, therefore, understandable from the facts mentioned above, how, through different handlings in diverse periods, this transcendental ego has assumed the status of the transcendental *puruṣa* of the classical *Sāmkhya*, without the patronage of the 26th principle, namely the *puruṣottama*. (The ultimate reality which is all inclusive). Different categories of Nature are also more fully analysed and the order of their development is also more clearly explained in the epic although there is variation from the classical *Samkhya* in this respect. The five elements are not always derived from *ahamkāra*, and different views are given regarding the development of the categories. The *Sāmkhya* ideas are thus in the process of formation, side by side with the other orthodox systems. In this manner, a definite advance from the *Upaniṣadic* state, so far as systematization of materials is cocerned, is visible in the epic philosphy. The *Mahābharata* definitely says that all sufferings are due to the false identification of *Prakṛti* and *kṣetrajña* and that the final liberation will be effected from a recognition of the distinction between spirit and matter. The *Sāmkhya*, in the epic, recognizes a plurality of souls only in the epirical sphere. The souls are many so long as they are in union with nature; but as soon as they become enlightended about their own distinction and difference from *Prakṛti*, they atonce return to the 26th principle of "*Puruṣottama*". The epic philosophy is, thus, definitely theistic in its general outlook and the elements of *Sāmkhya* are mostly pressed into the service of this trend of thought. The *Mahābhārata* describes the philosophies of *Sāmkhya* and *Yoga* as two eternal ancient systems taught by *Kapila* and *Hiranyagarbha* respectitively, and they were then not separated. The *Sāmkhya* is the highest truth, with a belief in God, as the 26th principle of the Universe.

Teachings of Pañcaśikha on Atheistic Line:

The view of *Pañcaśikha* (mentioned as the disciple of *Āsuri*) is,

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

however, different from this theistic conception which is so prominent in the *Mahābhārata*. According to him, the highest reality is not the *Puruṣottama* or God, transcending and absorbing both spirit and matter. It is rather a unified category of *avyakta* and *puruṣa* (*Puruṣā-vastham avyaktam*) or in the words of Prof. S.N. Das Gupta, it is "*Avyakta* in the state of *Puruṣa*".(1) Consciousness is not the essence of the self. It is due in all cases to the conglomerated association of our body, mind and the element of cetas. 'Cetas' is the psychical element which is to be combined with the physical elements to generate consciousness in the self. Consciousness arises from the unification of these psycho-physical elements with the self, and these elements are the constituents of *avyakta*,—the ultimate ground of this objective world. The collective whole of the elements is called the '*kṣetra*' and the self that resides in the mind is called the *Kṣetrajña*(2). The existence of the self is admissible; as otherwise, we shall have to believe that all ceases with death, which is not really true. (*Uccedaniṣṭhā nehāsti*). Again, in the absence of a postulate of self, it will be difficult for us to give a rational explanation of duties and the sense of moral responsibility. To prove his point of view, *Pañcaśikha* has introduced a critical discussion on the *buddhistic* and the *lokāyata* views(3) both of which deny the existence of a permanent self. Consciousness can never be produced from a combination of different physical elements only to perform the functions of life and its various processes. If consciousness is regarded as a quality of the body only, then we are in a fix to understand why it vanishes altogether from a dead body which is still a conglomeration of all *bhautika* elements. That which residing in the body, the body lives and departing from the body, it dies, must be different and other than the mere physical and elemental combination. This, therefore, is the soul. The *lokāyatas* do believe in the existence of deities who can be propitiated for the removal of cold, heat etc. Now, these deities cannot be mere elemental-conglomerations, since in that case they will be mortal like all other worldly things. So, the permanent soul does exist as the undeniable principle of life and all living processes. Further, formless consciousness cannot spring forth from elements, having forms, as this will contradict our experi-

1. History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. I p. 216.
2. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parvan) 219-16.
3. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parva-218).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

ence. Nor can we think of the self as a stream of passing mental states,as in that case, the results of A's actions will be enjoyed by B, and not by A who has performed those actions. Hence, as the permanent upholder of consciousness, we are forced to believe in the existence of an abiding self, which truly constitutes the spiritual basis of life and experience. The state of release is, however, described as being identical with that when all rivers completely lose themselves in the ocean.(1) This is state of pure neutrality which cannot be described in terms of the usual qualifying adjectives. For that reason *Pañcaśikha* says that there is neither ultimate destruction, nor ultimate reality of a determinate type (*uccheda niṣṭhā nehāsti bhāvaniṣṭhā na vidyate*). The *mokṣa-state* is indefinable. It cannot be described as a state of consciousness, since consciousness is not the essence of the soul.

The three *gunas* are also spoken of; but these *gunas* are as usual, referred to signify the good and bad qualities of the mind. The elements become conglomerated naturally and there is no need for any prime mover or God. The various organs of sensation and action, with their objects, are also elaborately discussed by *Pañcaśikha*. The elements of the material bodies remain together in a collective whole by their nature and they are separated also in the same manner. One who confuses this conglomeration of body-mind with the soul suffers misfortunes and misery and is never released from bondage. Since this coglomeration is not the self, any attachment to this as "I' and 'mine' is false.

A similar view is also sketched in the *Śānti Parvan* (203) in which the self apart from the body is described as imperceptible on account of its non-manifesting character, like the moon of the new moon-day. In other words, the self in itself is characterless and it acquires characteristics only when it becomes associated with the body. This is also the view of *Pañcaśikha* on the nature of the self. In the state of release the soul becomes "*Alinga*" and unmanifest. *Pañcaśikha's* teaching may be regarded as a continuation of the idea of the *Brhad Upaniṣad* where it is said (by *yājñā-valkya*) that after death there is no consciousness. Just as a lump of salt, dissolved into water, is completely lost in it, and it is not possible to detect it, yet where

1. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parva) 219-42.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

so ever you may take any part of it, it invariably tastes salty; so this great endless limitless being is solidified thought. Arising from these elements, it is destroyed after death, and there is no consciousness after death. This passage is, indeed, very obscure and even *Maitreyi*, his wife, took it in the sense that after death there could be no consciousness. (1) *Pañcaśikha* too has tried to establish his doctrine in the same strain. In his opinion salvation means complete destruction of all positive characteristics, including consciousness. Consciousness arises from the conglomeration of elements and is destroyed along with them. At death, there is no consciousness.(2) The atheistic teaching of *Pañcaśikha*, later on, has found a more detailed and logical development in the *Sāmkhya* of caraka; and most probably this trend of thought, by gradually gathering strength, has ultimately developed into the traditional atheistic *Sāmkhya* of *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*. In Prof. S.N. Das Gupta's opinion, the *Sāmkhya* of *Pañcaśikha* is very important in the sense that this (after finding a proper development in caraka's writings) formulates the transitional link of thought between the *upaniṣadic* doctrine and the orthodox *Sāmkhya* view.(3) Mr. A.B. Keith, in his *Sāmkhya-system*, maintains that this system of *Pañcaśikha* has no connection with the *Sāmkhya-system* either in general outlines or in details; but if we go through the *Ātreya-sāmkhya*, as detailed in the "*Caraka-Samhitā*" of the post *Mahābhāratic* age, we do find avery close resemblance between the two. In both, the existence of the individual is boldly asserted and at the same time, it has been maintained that in the end the individual self is merged in the great ocean of an indeterminate being, losing all knowledge, feeling and action. Both are atheistic, as both of them do not assert the existence of any God or creative personality to serve as the basic principle of creation.

—:(⌣):—

1. (2. 4. 13. Bṛhad. Upa.)
2. The Mahābhārata (Śānti Parva, 219).
3. Chap. on "Sāmkhya in caraka", History of Indian Philosophy Vol. I Page 219 page 219.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

4th CHAPTER

Sāṃkhya in the Gītā :

In the *Gītā*, the word *Sāṃkhya* has been used in many contexts, but no where it has been used in the sense of *Kapila Sāṃkhya* or any other form of *Sāṃkhya*. There is reference of the word *Sāṃkhya* in the second chapter of the *Gītā*, but here, it cannot be interpreted in any manner except "pursuit of true knowledge".(1) In other words, in this context, the word *Sāṃkhya* is clearly used in the sense of the path of philosophic wisdom, leading to the realisation of the essential nature of the soul or *ātman*. Lord *Kriṣṇa* says that so far he has explained, in details, the doctrine of self-knowledge to *Arjuna*, his favourite disciple, and that now, he is going to give him instruction regarding the path of duties (*Karma-yoga*). His subsequent instruction thus refers actually to *karma-yoga* or the disinterested performance of duties. *Sāṃkhya-yoga* or "the path of knowledge" directly destroys ignorance which is the root cause of human misery and is, therefore, meant for those blessed seekers who are endowed with keen intellectual and volitional power for discrimination and renunciation.

In a passage in the third chapter, the word *Samkhya* is definitely used in the sense of "wisdom", as it has been stated that the *Sāṃkhyas* (wisemen) follow the path of knowledge for attaining liberation from the miseries of the world.(2) Both *Śaṃkara* and *Śrīdhara Svami* have taken the world *Sāṃkhyānam* in the sense of wise people.(3) These wise people are born, as it were, with a thorough and clear knowledge of *ātman*, and their earnest devotion to knowledge helps them to renounce the world for the sake of direct realisation of the highest truth. Again, it has been stated in the Chap. 13 (4) that there are persons who perceive the self in accordance with the *Sāṃkhya-yoga*. *Śaṃkara* and *Sridhara svāmi* have interpreted the word *Sāṃkhya* as the doctrine of the discriminatory

1. The Bhagavat Gītā Chap. 2-39.
2. The Bhagvad Gītā Chapter 3-3.
3. Śrīdharasvāmi: Sāṃkhyānām śudhāntaḥ-karaṇānām jñānabhūmi kāmārudhānām.
4. Chap. 13-25 Ibid.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

knowledge of *puruṣa*, *prakṛti* and the *guṇas*. *Śaṃkara* has explained the meaning of the word *Sāṃkhya* only, but the word *yoga* is left unexplained. *Śrīdhara svāmi* has tried to make his position better by identifying the word *yoga* with the *Aṣṭānga yoga* of *Patañjali*(1) but Prof. S. N. Das Gupta has pointed out in his History of Indian Philosophy (Vol. II) that *Śrīdhara svāmi* has failed to explain how this *Aṣṭānga-yoga* can be identified with the philosophy of the *Sāṃkhya*. Indeed, *Patañjali's Astanga-yoga* is not totally identical with *Kapila's Sāṃkhya* and for that reason, while identifying these two, one is undoubtedly required to give a rational justification for his own stand. The *Gītā again* says, "Ignorant people only think that *Sāṃkhya* and *yoga* are different, but the wise man always realises fully the unity between the two." The followers of *Sāṃkhya* reach the same goal which is also reached by the followers of *yoga*, so he, who perceives them as identical, percieves the truth.(2) The fact that here too *Sāṃkhya* and *yoga* do not refer to the traditional *Sāṃkhya* and *yoga* doctrines, is clearly made evident by the following words of Prof. S.N. Das Gupta. "In these passages, *Sāṃkhya* and *yoga* seem, from the context, to refer respectively to *Karma-Sannyāsa* and *Karma-yoga*. *Sāṃkhya* here can only in a secondary way mean the renunciation of the fruits of one's actions. The person who realises the true nature of his self, and knows that the self is unchangeable and infinite, cannot feel himself attached to the fruits of his actions and cannot be affected by ordinary mundane desires and carvings. As in the case of the different uses of the word *Yoga*, so here also the word *Sāṃkhya*, which primarily means true knowledge, is also used to mean renunciation; and since *Karma-yoga* means the performance of one's duties in a spirit of renunciation, *Sāṃkhya* and *yoga* mean practically the same thing and are, therefore, identified here and they are both regarded as leading to the same results."(3) Thus, *Sāṃkhya* and *yoga* are regarded as identical only in the sense of renunciation and not in the sense of the traditional *Sāṃkhya-yoga* doctrines of *Kapila* and *Patañjali* schools.

From the above discussion, it is clear that the word *Sāṃkhya* has been used in a special sense in the philosophy of the *Gītā*,

1. The Bhagavad-Gītā Chap. 13-25.
2. The Bhagavad Gītā Chap. 5-4. 5.
3. History of Indian Philosophy Vol. II page 457.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

although this sacred book too aims at imparting to us a thorough knowledge of *puruṣa*, *prakṛti* and *gunas*.

Puruṣottama, Prakṛti and Ātman:

The Highest Reality preached by the *Gītā* is the all inclusive *God*, who comprises within Himself both *Prakṛti* and *puruṣa* and thereby becomes the Supreme Lord and the main stay of the whole universe. *Prakṛti* is the lower nature, since it is the material stuff of the whole universe. This lower nature contains within itself the five elements, mind, *buddhi* and *ahaṃkara*. Higher than this is God's superior nature which consists of the living souls. This superior nature is the principle, by which this insentient *prakṛti* is sustained and animated. These two *prakṛtis* (*aparā* and *parā*) are the cause of the whole creation and dissolution (1) (the lower nature manifesting itself as the insentient universe and the higher nature as the living soul or the experiencer of the world). Since both represent different phases of God's nature, He is the real support of the universe, like the string of the gems on a necklace.(2) *Prakṛti*, no doubt, creates the universe; but it is only an instrument of God, having no independent existence of its own, Hence the *Gītā* says that the 'Purusottama' is the ultimate cause of the whole world of things and beings. The three gunas and all their products are also grounded in Him. He is the essence of water, the brilliance of the Sun, and the Moon, the sound of ether, the brightness in fire, the life force in all living beings and the manliness in man. In other words, the Lord exists in all beings as their essential quality. But this Lord is not wholly immanent in this world; His true nature is transcendent and beyond the range of human comprehension. Only a portion of Him (i.e. His aparā and parā prakṛti) is revealed in the universe. The lower nature of God entangles the spirit in this world and being entangled, the spirit resides in all beings as their sustaining prineiple.

The Kṣetra and the Kṣetrajña:

The psycho-physical organism, which is generally called the body, is technically termed as *Kṣetra* in the *Gītā*. This *Kṣetra* com-

1. The Gītā Chap. 7-4. 5 & 6.
2. The Gītā Chap. 7-7.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

prises within itself the five elements, *ahaṃkāra*, *buddhi*, *avyakta*, the senses, the mind, the five objects of the senses, desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, the power of holding together all these mental functions, the reflection of the *ātman* as intelligence in the psycho-physical structure, constituting our phenomenal knowledge and fortitude.(1)

We may, however, mention here that the word *Cetanā* as a constitutent of the *Kṣetra* has been used by us in the sense of the *vṛttijñāna* or phenomenal knowledge, formed as a result of combined participation of internal organs and pure consciousness. In this respect, may we be allowed to differ respectfully from Prof. S.N. Das Gupta, as he has taken this word in the sense of consciousness and also as a constituent of the psycho-physical complex. In his opnion, the *Gita* does not seem to describe the self as pure consciousness.(2) It is, indeed, true that the second chapter of the *Gītā*, which contains an elaborate description of the nature of the soul, simply states that the soul is changeless, deathless, indescribable and unthinkable, without making any suggestion whatsoever about its conscious nature(3); but at the time of discussing the distinction between the field and the knower of the field, the *Gītā* does make an implicit reference to self's conscious nature by mentioning it as the illuminator of the whole world(4). Luminosity is a characteristic that can be ascribed to 'consciousness' alone, because it is the only principle that can act as light for the revelation of the whole universe. Since the self is spoken of as the light of the world, it must have 'consciousness' as an igredient of its own nature, and not as an accidental quality, borrowed from the *Kṣetra*. Had this power of luminosity been borrowed from the *Ksetra* by the *kṣetrajna*, then the field itself would have been called the real illuminator and not the self, just as our eyes are never regarded as the real seers of objects, on account of the borrowed nature of their light. In fact, the story of the *Gītā* was built up on the background of a civil war, and the philosophy taught in this sacred book was specially meant to remove anxiety and inacitivity of *Arjuna* who sat on the chariot, hopelessly disappointed and dejected, leaving aside his bows and arrows. He

1. The Gita-Chap. 13-6-7.
2. History of Indian Philosophy Vol. II-p. 471.
3. The Gita Chap. 2-25.
4. Ibid-13, 34.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

was wholly unwilling to kill his own relatives. Hence, for removing this dampness of his spirit and rousing him up from this state of depression, *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* started instructing *Arjuna* about the imperishable nature of the soul. All teachings of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa*, regarding the nature of the soul were, therefore, mainly concentrated on its imperishable and indestructible aspect and not on its other characteristics. The soul is eternal and immortal and it remains unchanged through all the variations that take place in the body. Birth and death happen to this body only, and not to the soul. Weapons cannot tear it, fire cannot burn it, water cannot destory it and air cannot dry it. So, *Arjuna* should not cherish the idea of the self as killed. It is, therefore, no wonder that no special reference to the conscious nature of the soul was made by the Lord in the *Gita* as this was not deemed necessary for the purpose. Moreover, the *Gītā* is accepted as an interpretation of the *Upaniṣadic* truth, and therefore, it is quite reasonable to suppose that this sacred book did not venture to make such a bold departure from the *upaniṣadic* trend by non-acceptance of the essentially conscious nature of the soul. Of course, in the second chapter the soul is spoken of as *Avyakta* and if we interpret this word in the sense of "unmanifest", then the self too is to be described as unmanifest. But the word *Avyakta* can also be understood as referring to a category which is subtle and, therefore, beyond the range of sense-perception. And the *upaniṣads* do teach us that the positive and definite content of the *Ātman* cannot be grasped by any of our sense-organs. It is unutterable, inconceivable, unchangeable and ungraspable by the sources of empirical knowledge. The way to describe the *Ātman* or *Brahman* is thus by *neti neti*, it is not this, it is not this. Positive definitions are impossible. *Śamkara* and *Śrīdhara svāmi* have also taken the word *Cetanā* (a factor of the *Kṣetra*) in the sense of the phenomenal knowledge (1) and this *vṛttijñāna*, which is always obtained through the instrumentality of *Antaḥkaraṇa* is, indeed, a part of Nature. *Kṣetrajña*, therefore, may be understood to refer to the witnessing self or the transcendental consciousness which is the central principle of unity in all knowledge and experience. It is in essence the same as the Supreme Spirit that actually dwells in different bodies as so many perceiving selves or knowers, without

1. The Gītā Chap. 13-7.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

getting affected in any way by the traits of the bodies, such as birth, growth, decay, death, etc. The encased *puruṣa*, that gets attached to *prakṛti*, suffers misery in life only through ignorance and confusion. Being over-powered with *avidyā*, the ignorant *jīva* identifies himself with the body which is enveloped with desire and attachment towards various objects of pleasure. He who considers the soul as above all, as being the lord of the body, is no longer to be afraid of the miseries of the world. It is the body that feels the worldly pleasures and pains and not the soul, which is the witness of all. The *Kṣetra* and the *Keṣtrajana* in all probability correspond to the lower and the higher nature of God and through these two natures, He creates, sustains and ultimately dissolves this vast universe. The duality, therefore, exists between the field and the knower of the field, as these two always remain associated in the phenomenal sphere.

Kṣarapuruṣa, Akṣarapurusa and Puruṣottama:

Kṣetrajña is also called the *Akṣarapuruṣa*(1) (unchangeable being) because it is the unchangeable principle of consciousness and manifests itself in so many mind-body systems as their indwelling souls. Being the transcendental self, it is the passive perceiver, thinker and enjoyer,—the active one being the phenomenal self or the intelligised *antaḥkaraṇa*. The phenomenal self is called the changeable *puruṣa*, because it, (being the product of the psycho-physical structure) changes with every change in the psycho-physical mechanism. But there is another principle distinct from the perishable and the imperishable called the *paramātman* which pervades and sustains the three worlds(2). He is the highest principle that transcends and absorbs both the *kṣarapuruṣa* and the *akṣarapuruṣa* and is therefore called the *puruṣottama*(3).

Thus, in the *Gītā*, we find the psycho-physical matrix holding as its parts, the intelligised *antaḥkaraṇa* or the phenomenal consciousness, the transcendental self or the foundational consciousness forming the central principle of all living beings, and the Highest principle or God, that stands beyond both of them and is the ultimate support of all things and beings of the universe.

1. The Gītā Chap. 15-16.
2. Ibid. Chap. 15-17.
3. The Gītā.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The Entanglement of Puruṣa and the Worldly Life of Pleasure and Pains:

Both *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* (matter and spirit) are to be regarded as beginningless. The *guṇas* and all their modifications are the products of Nature—the mother of the whole creation. The entanglement of the *kṣetrajña puruṣa* in *Prakṛti*, through ignorance, is the cause of the self's experience of pleasures and pains.(1) The soul falsely identifies itself with Nature and appears to experience misery and happiness. This apparent experience constitutes *puruṣa's saṃsāra* and makes it appear as an experiencing being. In reality the *Kṣetrajña* does not act, nor does it reap the fruits of its actions. (2) He who knows, thus,the distinction between the *kṣetrajña puruṣa* and *prakṛti* along with its *gunas*, is not born again and is wholly relieved from the sufferings of this world.

This union of *Kṣetrajña* and *Kṣetra* or spirit and matter which causes the birth of all beings is effected under the control and supervision of the Supreme Lord who, in fact, is the real creator, preserver and destroyer of the world. *Prakṛti*, therefore, is figuratively spoken of as the womb of the Supreme Being which He charges with the seed of consciousness, for the production of so many offsprings in the forms of men, animals, birds, trees, etc.(3)

By germs of God, the *Gītā*, most probably, refers to consciousness with which the soul or the *kṣetrajña* is endowed by Him. Through this *Kṣetrajña*, God places the seed of consciousness in Nature, and produces all created beings. Leaving aside such figurative expression, we can say plainly that all created beings in this world are produced by the union of spirit and matter through the will and power of God. The Lord Himself is the father and mother of the universe and both *puraṣa* and *prakṛti* inhere in Him.

The Guṇas:

The three *guṇas—sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, are born of Nature(4) and they constitute our experience-stuff. These are regarded as the universal characteristics of all kinds of mental tendencies and these

1. The Gītā Chap. 13-22.
2. Ibid. Chap. 13, 32.
3. The Bhagavad Gītā Chapter—14-3.
4. Ibid. Chap. 14-5.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

are also the springs of different kinds of action. *Sāttvika* actions are those which are prompted by the *Sattva guṇa* and are done under its influence. *Rājasika* and *tāmasika* actions, on the other hand, are done respectively under the influence of *rajas* and *tamas*. In the 14th chapter, it is stated that if at the time of death, there is a preponderance at *Sattva guṇa*, then the individual goes to a better world after death. If there is prepondernace of *rajas* at that time, then the individual is born as man, and if there is an excess of *tamas*, he is born as lower animals. In other words, the nature of birth is fully determined by the *guṇas* which reign supreme in the empirical world. All duties prescribed in the vedas are in the sphere of this world of the three *guṇas* and so *Arjuna* is advised (Chap. 2) to transcend this sphere of empirical existence. Knowledge also is regarded as *sāttvika*, *rājasika* and *tāmasika*. *Sāttvika* knowledge helps us to realise the one unchangeable reality in the midst of the apparent diversity of the world. *Rājasa* knowledge inspires us to make a scientific approach to important problems in the field of knowledge, while *tāmasa* knowledge refers to narrow and superstitious beliefs that always place obstacles on the path of self-realisation. This conception of the *guṇas* reveals that the *Gītā* too has used this word in the sense of psychical states and not in the sense of the ultimate constituents of the objective basis of the universe.

The Theory of Satkāryavāda :

The *Gītā* also preaches the doctrine of *Satkāryavāda* when it says "*Nā sato vidyate bhāva, nā bhāva vidyate satah*" (the existent can never cease to be, and the non-existent can never be made existent). If anything is really non-existent, it is absurd to maintain that it can be brought into existence. No intercourse of any kind is possible between the existent and the non-existent. The classical *Sāmkhya* also says that blue can never be turned into yellow even by a thousand artists. A particular effect can be produced from a particular cause, only because the latter possesses the potency for it.

Conclusion :

The *Gītā* resembles the *Upaniṣads* and the *Mahābhārata* in its theistic outlook and all through its teachings it has attempted to emphasise the supremacy of the Highest Lord.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The Reverend One is the manifestation of truth, eternally pure, and ever free from all bonds. It is by Him that *Prakṛti* is dominated. It is in Him that this Universe, both as existent and non-existent, is grounded. His metaphysical necessity is not less important than His ethical necessity. Without Him, there will be no creation and dissolution of the world. He is the abode of eternal *Dharma* and it is by worshipping Him with love and devotion that one can rise above the *guṇas* and be qualified for the attainment of liberation. In this respect, the *Gītā* conception of God differs from that of the *Yoga* philosophy. God in the *Yoga* philosophy is a *Purusa-visesa* who has never been subject to passions, desires and ignorance. He is not logically needed for creation or Universe, and His metaphysical necessity is almost unrecognized. Devotion to God can be utilised as an alternative device for the attainment of *Mokṣa* and so God has only some practical value in the moral life of human beings. He only helps His devotees by removing the barriers that lie in the path of their emancipation. But the Lord of the *Gītā* says, "Give up all *Dharmas* and come to me alone for solace and refuge; I shall deliver you from all sins and sorrows; do not grieve."

(*Sarvadharmān parityajya māmekam śaraṇam vraja, aham tvam sarvapapebhya mokṣayishyām mā śucah* (Chap. 18-66). Again, like the *Mahā*-bharata, the *Gītā* also asserts that both individual spirit and matter are aspects of the *purusottama*, but in this respect, the *Gītā* has been able to give us a fuller description of the all-inclusive personality of God than what we get in the *Sāṃkhya* teachings of the *Mahābhārata* (although it is still in an unsystematic and nabulous stage, with loose connections among its categories). The *Gītā* resembles the epic philosophy further, in the fact, that both of them have avoided a categorical enumeration of the twenty-five principles of the classical *Sāṃkhya*. In Chapter 13 of the *Gītā*, there is a mention of the 24 categories, but these are not the same as the 24 *tattvas* of the classical *Sāṃkhya*. Nevertheless, we are justified in saying that the philosophy of *Sāṃkhya*, which started in a nabulous condition in the *upaniṣads*, and became more prominent (though still in a fragmentary state) in the *Mahābhārata* had also received sufficient nourishment in the teachings of the *Gītā*, although this sacred book did not use the term *Sāṃkhya* in the traditional sense. The central

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

doctrines of the classical *Sāṃkhya* were afloat in germinal forms in the epic and the *Gītā*. These fragmentary elements were reduced afterwards to a regular system with new addition and alteration. Knowledge, for instance, in the *Gītā* means the concrete realisation of the spiritual unity of all, whereas in the classical *Sāṃkhya*, it means only the abstract understanding of the difference between *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. Again *Prakṛti* in the *Gītā* is only an aspect or power of God, and is never viewed as a self-subsistent principle, as in the classical *Sāṃkhya*. But both the *Gītā* and the classical *Sāṃkhya* hold that the union of spirit and matter is the cause of this life of *samsāra*, and that all sufferings and pains really happen to nature, and not to the soul, which is always pure and free. Under the spell of ignorance, the unchangeable and inactive self indentifies itself with the body, and owns all happiness and misery through mistake. The *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, however, does not advocate the existence of one ultimate uniting principle like the *Gītā*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Upaniṣads*. The transcendental *kṣetrajña*, which is inactive and unchangeable, becomes, therefore, an independent principle in the classical *Sāṃkhya*; and not only that, the plurality of the transcendental souls also follows logically from the plurality of *Kṣetrajña puruṣas*. Ofcourse, in the *Gita*, there is no clear declaration that the *aparā prakṛti* is identical with *Mahad Brahma* that produces the *guṇas* and all other products. But since both of them are spoken of as parts of the Lord, they may reasonably be regarded as identical. As the father, He emits the seeds and as the mother, He again receives it, thereby bringing into existence various forms of beings. Although this metaphorical description of *Prakrti* as the *Yoni* of God may suggest the idea that *Prakṛti*, as the female part co-exists with Lord, its master, still from the consideration of the contents (both prior and posterior to this description) it seems just and reasonable, on our part to unify both these *Prakṛtis*, and accept them as forming the lower nature of God, who is the only principle of the whole universe. The *Gītā* repeatedly asserts the existence of one ultimate principle as the final cause, and so the recognition of another co-existent and ultimate principle is not justifiable from any point of view. Prof. S.N. Das Gupta has also said: "It is quite possible that the primary meaning of *Prakṛti* in the *Gītā* is God's nature; the other meaning of *Prakṛti* as an ultimate principle from which the *guṇas* are produced

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

is simply the hypostatisation of God's nature"(1). In course of time, with greater and greater leaning towards the dualistic position, this *Prakṛti* or lower nature of God is transformed into an independent principle, co-existing and co-operating with the transcendental *puruṣas* for creation and preservation of this empirical world.

Another important contribution of the *Gītā* to the classical *Sāṃkhya* is the laying down of the principle of *Sātkarya-vāda* which assumes an important role in the *Sāṃkhya Karika* of *Īśvarakṛsna*. It is the *Gītā* that emphatically declares, for the first time, the principle that the existent can never arise from the non-existent and that the non-existent can never be made existent.(2) This principle, in due course, forms the basis of the *Sāṃkhya* theory of *Satkārya-vāda*, which believes in the existence of the effect in the cause prior to its production. We have already discussed, in the chapter on the classical *Sāṃkhya*, how this theory of causation reduces the whole of this phenomenal world to a modification of the three ultimate reals, known as *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. Birth, death, old age and sorrow exist in this world of the three *guṇas*, and therefore, the real and the highest goal of human life is to seek liberation from the net-work of these gunas. The three *guṇas* create bondage and simultaneously nurse in themselves the secret of emancipation. They create the world for the experience of the *puruṣa*; but at the same time, to set the soul free, the *guṇas* also display the tendency to withdraw within themselves—thereby dissolving the world-show for the liberated spirit. The person who, with increased *sāttvika* knowledge, can understand the soul as pure, all pervading, ever unenshrouded and devoid of all influences of the *guṇas* (even being encased in the body), is not disturbed by any physical or mental agitation. Such a man is not afraid of the miseries of the world, and the world actually ceases to exist for him.

1. History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. II p. 463.
2. The Gītā Chap. 2-16.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

5th CHAPTER

MANU SMṚTI AND SOME OF THE OLDER PURĀṆAS

The *Purāṇas* generally devote some section of their literature to the treatment of the creation and the dissolution of the world; and it is in such a section that we invariably come across the conception of dual principles, laying at the root of this manifold universe.

THE VISṆU PURĀṆA

Viṣṇu, Puruṣa, Prakṛti and Kāla:

The highest Reality is called *Vāsudeva* in the *Viṣṇu-purana*, where it has been described as pure existence, single, eternal, unborn and in-exhaustible. It is all-pervading and there is no impure external entity to be got rid of. *Vyakta, avyakta, purusa* and *kāla* are its four different forms (1). *Puruṣa* is superior to *Prakṛti* because of its *cetanattva* (consciousness) and, therefore, it emerges first of all from the Great Lord, Viṣṇu, who alone is the *Supreme* Category. All these four forms (*vyakta, avyakta, kāla* and *puruṣa*) are the offshoots of His playful activity. This conception of play resulting in creative action is almost a common idea in the *Purānic* literature; but in the orthodox *Sāṃkhya*, the realisation of some teleological purpose by *Prakṛti* is supposed to be the basic principle involved in the process of evolution. *Prakṛti* is described here as *Triguṇatmikā, Sadasadātmikā* and *nitya*, (in the sense of always keeping its nature the same), she is the cause of the whole universe and both the processes of evolution and dissolution take place in her bosom. The function of *Kāla* is to associate *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* during creation and also to put them apart at the time of dissolution.(2)

Both *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* are different from the essential nature of God, although He is the real container of these different forms. *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* remain disconnected, when the *guṇas* are in the

1. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa—1, 2, 11, 12 & 13.
2. The Visnu-purana 1, 2, 24.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

state of equilibrium. (1) It is at this moment that the element of time emerges from the Lord and connects the two together. So, in the act of creation, time functions as the joining thread that holds together the two apparently diverse forms of *vāsudeva*. Thus, the "locus standi" of both spirit and matter is the same in the *Visnu Purāna* and these two are not ultimate or final. Hence, though on the surface, these two forms appear to be the cause of the world, yet after taking a deep plunge into the spirit of this philosophy, one will be forced to admit that the world rests finally on God and not on any one of these derived entities. When God enters, through His will, into *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* and sets them in motion through the instrumentality of time, He actually disturbs some parts of His own Nature and playfully creates the world. Hence, real energy or dynamic force lying at the root of the world is some spiritual influence of God that brings together *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* in time. Since it is the will power of God that disturbs the equilibrium, the entrance or penetration of God into spirit and matter does not mean any inter-course in the physical sense. It is, therefore, said that God starts the process of evolution by mere proximity, and that in this act, He Himself remains unaffected, just as sweet fragrance of flowers remains unchanged in character even after creating much disturbance in the mind of the recipient.(2)

The Process of Creation:

While describing the process of creation, the *Viṣṇu-purāna* says that from Nature, emerges as its first product, the *mahat-tattva*, which still remains covered by it. But even in this covered state, the *mahat* differentiates itself as *sāttvika*, *rājasika* and *tāmasika*. From this three-fold *mahat*, the three-fold *ahaṃkāra* (known as *vaikārika*, *taijasa* and *bhūtādi* or *tāmasa*) comes into being. *Ahaṃkāra*, in its three-fold nature, remains covered by the *mahat-tattva*. From the *tāmasa ahaṃkāra* (covered by the *mahat*) arises spontaneously the *Sabda-tanmātra* and from that by the same process, is produced the element of *ākāsa*. Both of them remain covered by *tāmasa ahaṃkāra*. The *ākāśa* again produces *sparśa-tan mātra* and from that arises air. The *bhūtādi*, of course, envelops all of them. The air then produces

1. Ibid 1, 2, 27.
2. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa 1. 2. 30.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

rūpa-tanmātra, from which *tejas* comes into being. *Rūpa-tanmātra*, again, is covered up by *sparśa tanmātra*. Other *tanmātras* and the corresponding gross elements are produced in a similar manner. These *tanmātras* are various potential qualities of objects, and hence, they themselves are non-specific or *avisesa*. The three well-known qualities of the three *gunas* (*Sānta, Ghora* and *Mūḍha*) are not manifest in them. The ten conative and cognitive senses are produced from the *taijasa ahaṃkāra* while *vaikārika ahaṃkāra* produces only the mind.

Kūrma Purāṇa:

According to the *Kūrma Purāṇa* too, God, first of all, exists as the unmanifested, infinite and unknowable principle. As the cosmic cause, He is called *Prakṛti* (an equilibriated state of the *guṇas*) and in this aspect, He is regarded as *para-brahma*. He is also the *puruṣa* that serves as the basic spiritual principle of the universe. By His own power (spiritual), God enters into *Puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and acts as their inner creative force, remaining, however, in close union with them all the time. From the disturbed state of spirit and matter springs up the seed of *mahat* which partakes of the nature of both.(1) The first evolute is thus supposed to be of a mixed character that makes it fit for evolving the psycho-physical universe. From this seed, then, comes out *mahāt* which in its turn produces the three fold *ahaṃkāra*. From *taijasa* and *vaikārika ahaṃkāra* arise the eleven senses of conation and cognition. The *tanmātras* and the corresponding gross elements are produced from the *bhūtādi* or *tānasa ahamkara*. The creation and the dissolution of the universe are happening in a cyclic order due to the playful activity of God.

The Mārkandeya Purāna:

The *Mārkandeya Purāna* believes that *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are not finally independent. These are the two forms of *vāsudeva* who with the help of time (His other power) connects or separates them for the creation and the dissolution of the world. It, however, holds that *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* emerge from *ahaṃkāra*, which is not, therefore, the effect of the three *guṇas*. The *Gītā* also preaches that the three "*Guṇas*" are the evolutes of Nature. In the *Gītā*, however,

1. Kūrma-Purāna—

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the process of the evolution of the *Guṇas* is not very clear. This *Purāṇa* definitely states that they have originated from *ahaṃkāra*, an evolute of *Prakṛti*. *Sattva* produces the presiding deities of the ten senses and the *manas*; from *rajas* come into existence the ten senses and the *buddhi*; and from *tamas*, are produced the *tanmātras* and the *bhūtas*.

Conclusion:

This brief survey of the theories of creation, discussed in some of the older *purāṇas*, will most probably lay bare the fact that the conception of duality at the root of creation, together with the belief in the gradual unfoldment of the universe, through a contact between the two principles, forms a common feature of all *purāṇic* literatures. But this duality springs only from a playful motive of God and is not final. The ultimate Reality is described every where as one only without a second. The Highest reality is *guṇātīta* and pure, yet it can operate as a creative agent by virtue of its unthinkable powers. So, in relation to the world, God becomes the real creative agent, spontaneously manifesting Himself in and through all things and beings. All this is created in Himself and out of Himself. He is both the creator and the created. Therefore, He alone is real and *Sat*. Hence, the *Sāṃkhya* that may be traced out from the *Purāṇic* materials will be fundamentally theistic and monistic, differing thereby from the doctrine of the classical school. This theistic rendering of the *Sāṃkhya*, presented so far, through the teachings of the *upaniṣads*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Gītā* and the *Purāṇas*, admits of a gradation of realities, some of which are more real and more stable than the others. In the *Gītā*, for example, *Puruṣottama* is declared as the Highest Reality, whereas *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, being His derivative forms, are supposed to be less real. Similarly, in the *Purānas*, the *Paramātman* or *Vāsudeva* is the truly real Being, whereas all other categories are only derivative and therefore secondary from the point of view of reality.

The Manu Smṛti:

In the *Manu-smṛti* too, which is a contemporary of the *Mahābhārata*, there is a very clear description of the three *guṇas* (*sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*) although there is no reference of the word *Samkhya*

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

in any context. *Sattva, rajas* and *tamas* are supposed to be present in each and every *Jīva*. The character of a man is determined by the *guṇa* that is prominent in him. Here, the three *guṇas* are, as usual, supposed to represent the three types of mental qualities. *Sattva* gives rise to knowledge, pleasure and purity of mind, *tamas*, to ignorance, delusion, irrationality etc., and *rajas* creates aversion and attachment.(1) All pious and venerable deeds owe their origin to the *Sattva guṇa* whereas enjoyment of worldly pleasures etc. are due to the predominance of *rajas*. *Tama guṇa*, on the other hand, encourages *nāstikatā*, greed, sluggishness, wrong knowledge, irreligious mood, etc. A reference to the three pramānas, recognised in the *Sāṃkhya* system, is also present in it. Hence, though no explicit mention of the *Samkhya* doctrine is available in this book, it gives a very detailed account of the three *gunas* which form the central doctrine of the orthodox *Sāṃkhya system*.

1. The Manu-smrti—Chap. 12, 24-29.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

6th CHAPTER

The Bhāgavata:

As a devotional literature, the *Bhāgavatapurāna* shares with the *Bhagavad-gītā* the same appreciation and religious glory, but not the same age. It was not written before the 10th century A.D. This sacred book, therefore, claims for its origin a period much latter than that of the *Sāmkhya-Kārikā* of *Īśvara Kṛṣṇa*, although the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy, outlined in this book, is identified with the original doctrine of Kapila. The *Bhāgavata-Sāṃkhya* is essentially theistic, and it bears resemblances with the *vedānta* of the *Upanisads*.

Purusa and Prakrti:

According to the *Bhāgavata-purāna*, the ultimate reality is one beginningless, self-shining being, which is beyond the sphere of the *guṇas*. It shines forth in all individual souls and is superior to *prakṛti*.(1) In the beginning He was all alone in Himself and His powers also remained submerged in Him. Being bored by such awful loneliness, He began to feel uneasy and uncertain about himself. So, he disturbed the equilibrium of His own *Māyā-śakti* through the instrumentality of Time, which was His own transcendental capacity and also through His own self, he placed the seed of consciousness in *Māyā*, and thence started the process of creation.(2) This description is, no doubt, allegorical, and by way of interpretation, we may say that for the realisation of Himself through an 'Other' (not in existence) God reflected His own consciousness in his own 'Power' through the instrumentality of Time. Then, in his own reflected state, He became enchanted under the sweet delusion, caused by *Prakṛti*, which then started creating varied forms after her own fashion.(3) Thus, the transcendental self seems to have been seemingly dislodged from its supreme state of transcendence, and a new category of fictitious self seems to have emerged therefrom. Due to ignorance, this fictitious self fails to distinguish itself from

1. The Bhagavata Purana—3, 26—3.
2. The Bhagavata Purana 2.5—22.
3. Ibid—3. 26—5.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Prakṛti and it, therefore, thinks of itself as the doer of all natural actions. The self, in fact, does not initiate any activity, the responsibility of which lies wholly with *Prakṛti*. Still he is made to undergo the consequences of all natural actions. Thus, in the *Bhāgavata-Purāna* two principal categories are recognized, viz., *Prakrti* and *Puruṣa* or the power and the possessor of power. But *Prakṛti* has no independent existence of its own, being the power of the supreme *purusa*. Nature is here described as consisting of the three *gunas*—unmanifest, eternal and homogeneous.(1) The peculiarity of the *Bhāgavata-Sāṃkhya* lies in the fact that here the supreme self, on its own initiative, has reflected itself in *Māyā* and has thus fallen under the influence of its own power. The position is otherwise in the classical *Sāṃkhya*, where the urge for creation lies inherent in the nature of *Prakṛti*.

The Concept of Time:

The act of disturbing the equilibrium from its dormant state of non-manifestation takes place through time. Time, therefore, is not regarded as a product of *Prakṛti* in the *Bhāgavata Purāna*. It exists in God as His transcendent effort and transforms the unmanifest nature into the form of the manifest world.(2) *Kāla* is also described as the external form of God from whom proceeds the activity of *Prakṛti*. He is the Reverend one Himself and *Kāla* too, who by His own divine active energy presides over the elements internally as *puruṣa* and externally as time.

Evolution of Categories:

The first category that originates from Nature is the *mahat* and it contains within it the germs of the entire universe. As it is of pure *sāttvika* nature, it is also called *citta* and *vāsudeva*. From the category of *mahat* arises the three-fold *ahaṃkāra*, viz., *vaikārika*, *taijasa* and *tāmasa*. The category of *manas* is an evolute from the *vaikārika ahaṃkāra* and all desires are but functions of this category. From the *taijasa ahaṃkāra*, the category of *buddhi* is produced. Both the cognitive and conative senses are also produced from this aspect of *ahaṃkāra*.(3) So, the *Bhāgavata* does not identify *mahat*

1. The Bhagavata Purana—3-26-10.
2. Ibid—3. 26-17-18.
3. The Bhagavata Purana—3. 26-23. 24, 29, 30.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

with *buddhi* and does not assign to *buddhi* the same position that has been given to it in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*. It is simply a form of the mind that presides over the organs and sense-objects. Doubts, errors, memory and determinateness are the functions of this category. From the *tāmasa ahaṃkāra*, the sound potential comes into being, and from it arises the element of *ākāsa*. The touch potential has evolved from *ākāsa* and from that the element of air. The light potential arises from a disturbance of air, and from that is produced the element of heat. The taste potential, in its turn, arises from heat and from that is produced the element of water. The smell potential and the element of earth also evolve in the same manner.

Transcendental Self and Jīvas:

It has already been pointed out that the real *puruṣa* always remains beyond the sphere of the three *guṇas*. It is never affected by the impurities of this empirical life and never comes under the influence of ignorance. It is the image of the Transcendental Spirit that remains imprisoned in this world and ceaselessly experiences the joys and griefs of this mundane existence. The finite selves are described as shadows of the pure *purusa* which being *nirguṇa* (beyond the sphere of the *guṇas*) and unchangeable in its transcendental glory, remains untouched by the magic spell of its own power, in which it throws its reflection in so many forms.(1) Prof. S.N. Das Gupta has truly remarked that by describing the finite selves as the reflections of images of one *Puruṣa*, the *Bhāgavata* has wiped out from its doctrine the touch of realism which is so well marked in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*. Indeed, the *Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavata* has a great affinity with the *vedānta* doctrine of the *upaniṣads* regarding the status of the *jīvas* and the world. The classical *Sāṃkhya* has accepted the idea of reflection; but for preserving the realistic tendency in full strength, the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* has advocated the existence of a plurality of transcendental *puruṣas*. Each *puruṣa* becomes associated with *buddhi* through reflection; (due to the operation of *avidyā*) and for

1. The Bhagavata Purana—III—27. 1.

(Just as the reflected sun only becomes affected by the impurities of water and not the real sun that shines high above in the sky, in the same manner the reflection of purusa in Prakrti (i.e. Jiva) only is exalted and pained by the pleasurable and painful touches of life. The real purusa (being changeless, inactive and nirguna) always shines forth in its transcendental glory and is never affected by the impurities of this mundane existence.)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

that reason, it falsely identifies itself with the intelligized intellect, thereby sharing (only seemingly) all its pleasures and pains. So, the subjective ground is real and not illusory. *Bhikṣu's* theory of double reflection makes a more determinate effort for establishing this transcendental *puruṣa* as the apparent subject of knowledge and experience. If the subject of knowledge is supposed to be illusory and unreal then knowledge that it acquires and the object that it knows become equally 'unreal' and 'false' (as is often the case with the dream-experience). The reality of the entire universe is consequently shattered and under-mined. This is the position of the *Bhāgavata Sāṃkhya*. In the *Gīta*, the *Kṣetrajña puruṣa* is spoken of as the real subjective ground of knowledge; and it being an aspect of the ultimate reality, the reality of the knower remains unimpaired. *Prakṛti* also is described as an aspect of God and so the world (which is a transformation of *Prakṛti*) is not unreal and false. The *Mahābhārata* too does not preach that the world, we live in, is false and untrue and that the knower is only an illusion. The individual *puruṣas* are described as so many limited forms of the one infinite *puruṣa*. Just as one fire becomes many and one air blows in different directions, in the same manner, one infinite *Puruṣa* appears as so many finite *Jīvas* who enjoy pleasures and suffer pains. But the *Sāṃkhya* in the *Bhāgavata* leans towards idealism and monism and by putting much stress on the illusory and dreamy nature of our experiences(1) it deviates remarkably from the path of realism. The real *puruṣa* is beyond the sphere of *Prakṛti* and it never even mistakenly owns the pleasures and pains of the worldly life. All inspiration and liveliness Nature derives from the reflected consciousness of infinite *Puruṣa*. So the transcendental being remains entirely dissociated from the operation theatre of *Prakṛti*. The infinite replicas of infinite *puruṣa* which are as false as the reflected images of the sun and the moon, are made to suffer from Nature's torments and turbulences. Being endowed with egoism, these finite selves think of themselves as active agents in the process of creation. Thus, they groan and shiver, weep and toil in life through ignorance and confusion. But here we should also remember that inspite of this strong idealistic leaning the *Bhāgavata Sāṃkhya* has never minimised or slurred over the question of bondage and the feelings of joy and

1. The Bhagavata Purana 3. 27 (4).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

grief of this worldly life. Release from bondage, therefore, is a pressing problem in the *Bhāgavata*. When through devotion and discipline, the selves realise that their real locus standi is not *Prakrti* (though they are in it) but *Puruṣa* (which is the only underlying reality of the whole universe) they become free from the *Guṇas* of Nature and return to their transcendental origin. In this state of emancipation, *Prakṛti* remains wholly subdued, and so the bondage or encasement of the *Jīvas* comes to a final end.

Other Schools of Samkhya:

In the *Bhāgavata* (XI-22) a reference is made to different schools of *Sāṃkhya*; but no detailed information regarding their origin and development is available. Nevertheless, these different schools give us an idea of the different forms which the *Sāṃkhya* system has assumed from time to time in the writings of its different exponents. These different schools count their ultimate categories as three, four, five, six, seven, nine, eleven, thirteen, fifteen, seventeen, twenty-five and twenty-six. In the opinion of the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*, there is no real difference in the *Sāṃkhya* thought of these different schools. The difference that strikes us superficially is due to the fact that the effect categories are sometimes included within the cause categories and are not counted separately. When we think that *Purusa* cannot, by itself, attain liberation without the help of some higher spiritual principle, as it is under the influence of *avidyā*, we are at-once led to believe in the existence of a super-person or God. Consequently, we are tempted to affirm the existence of 26 categories. But if we identify *puruṣa* with God on the ground of their essential unity, and do not count them separately, then on this view, we shall come across 25 categories and not twenty-six.

But does not this difference in the number of categories enumerated really lead to a difference in the character of these two doctrines ? One proclaims its faith in God and thereby becomes theistic in outlook, while the other adopts an atheistic attitude by remaining silent on God. Quantitative difference does in many cases lead to qualitative difference or difference in the whole character of an object.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Kapila, the Founder of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy:

The *Sāṃkhya* philosophy of the *Bhāgavata* is attributed to *Kapila*, who has been described as an incarnation of Lord *Viṣṇu*. Prof. S.N. Das Gupta says: 'In the absence of any proof to the contrary, it may be assumed that the account of *Sāṃkhya* attributed to *Kapila* in the *Bhāgavata* may generally be believed to be true.(1) Of-course, *Īśvara Kṛṣṇa*, in his *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, proclaims loudly that the classical *Sāṃkhya* was first taught by *Kapila* to *Āsuri* and then by him to *Pañcaśikha*, and that the *Kārikā* account was a summary of the *ṣaṣṭitantra* with the exception of the fables, yet we can reasonably suppose on the evidence collected from the *Mahābhārata*, the *Bhāgavata*, the older *purāṇas* and the *Ahirbudnya Samhitā*, that the original teaching of *Kapila* was theistic. It had probably changed considerably in the hands of the different *Sāmkhyā-chāryas*, and was ultimately reduced to this classical form. Many people think that *Kapila* was not a historical personality, as he was often identified with *Agni* or *Viṣṇu* or *Śiva*. Whatever may be the reason for questioning the historical existence of this great sage, this fact is certain that the original account of the *Sāṃkhya*, as discussed in the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*, was theistic, and that the *Sāṃkhya* thought of most of the *Purāṇas* and also of the *Ahirbudnya Samhitā* was more faithful to the *Original Sāmkhya* than the *Sāmkhya Kārikā* of *Īśvara Kṛṣṇa*.

1. History of Indian Philosophy—Vol. IV p. 36.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

7th CHAPTER

THE AHIRBUDHNYA-SAMHITA

The Ultimate Reality:

The account of *Sāṃkhya*, available in the *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*, is a development of the theistic branch and consequently here too we find that *Param Brahma* or *Nārāyaṇa* is regarded as the Supreme Reality, ruling over life and the universe. He is described as the beginningless, endless eternal being, devoid of all names and forms, indescribable, unthinkable and absolutely changeless.(1) He is also of the nature of intuition, of pure and infinite bliss and He dwells in the hearts of all things and beings. He is as calm as the waveless ocean.(2) This unchangeable state is His transcendental nature, when his Power remains latent in Him. At this stage, the Supreme Reality remains alone without any creation. It is *Kūtastha* and therefore steady and immoveable. But when the dormant power of God is roused up, the evolution and manifestation of the world is at once effected. This power is not separate from the Supreme Reality. Śakti is as inseparable from the *Param Brahma* or God as the moonbeam from the moon.(3) Just as heat and not fire causes burning and change, in the same way the power and not the unchangeable reality creates changes and manifests this world of ours. God, with six qualities, forms the idea of splitting Himself into many, and this divine idea or the supreme thought activity of God is known as *Sudarśana*(4). *Sudarśana Śakti* is thus homogeneous with the *Lakṣmi-śakti* (the power of thought and will) of God. The power of God is one and it is in a sense identical with Him. When this power uses itself in the creative operation, it assumes different forms.

His Power and its Various Forms:

The Divine power of thought and will is called *Lakṣmi*,(5) as it creates the world. By virtue of this *Lakṣmi śakti*, God remains

1. Ahirbudhñya Samhitā—Chap. 2—3.
2. Ibid—Chap. 2. 22. 23.
3. Ahirbudhñya Samhitā Chap. 3.4.
4. Ibid Chap. 2—62.
5. Ibid Chap. 3. 9.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

engaged in an eternal act of creation, unaided by any other being. This power manifests itself primarily in two forms—static and dynamic. *Avyakta*, *Kāla* and *Puruṣa* are the static manifestations, and in its dynamic aspect, it manifests itself as will and thought resulting in action.(1) This *Viṣṇu Śakti* is also capable of splitting itself up into dual forms, like consciousness and the object of consciousness, manifest and non-manifest, the enjoyer and the enjoyed, etc. So, both subjectivity and objectivity here are supposed to have developed from a common source.

In the original state, this power remains non-creative and still and then suddenly it changes itself, we know not why, from the state of pure potency to a state of overt activity.(2) Here, no playful motive of God has been mentioned to account for the creative awakening of His power. In fact, throughout the whole course of evolution, the thought movement of God does break itself up into thinker and the thought, the body and that which is embodied, the subject and the object. This Divine *Sakti* does not involve mechanical movement like physical power. It is not different from God and is of the nature of unrealised thought and will, carrying in itself the enormous potency for creation and manifestation. It is, therefore, quite natural that it should seek to realise itself in subject-object forms being inspired by its inner dynamism. Since God is in possession of such an unhindered flow of will and thought-power, He can carry on creative operations, without the help of a second reality. The *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā* speaks of two forms of creation—pure and impure. The former is the evolution of the various deities, emanating from *vāsudeva*;(3) but, in the latter, the process of evolution springs forth from *Nārāyaṇa* who is one with His thought and will power. For bringing this world into being, the power of God, first of all, manifests itself in the static (*bhūti*) forms of *avyakta*, *kāla* and *puruṣa*.

Avyakta:

Avyakta, perhaps, refers to the unevolved state of *guṇa* in which the well-known trinity of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* are still unmani-

1. Ahirbudhnya Samhita Chap. 3-30.
2. Ibid—Chap. V 3. 4.
3. Ahirbudhnya Samhita Chap. 5-29.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

fested. Although, no explicit reference to this effect is available in this book yet in one context, the power of God is described as *avyakta-kāla puṃrūpā*(1) (manifesting itself in the forms of *avyakta*, *kāla* and *puruṣa*) and this *avyakta rūpa* is further described as changeable. Again, in another context *puruṣa*, *kāla* and *guṇa* in its unevolved state are spoken of as the three static forms (*bhūti*) of *bhagavat-śakti*(2) lying at the root of this world formation. The term *Prakṛti* is specially reserved for denoting only the equilibriated state of the three *guṇas*, which is not the whole of the *guṇa*-state. Since *Guṇa* in its unevolved state is supposed to be characterless, pure potentiality, it may be described as 'avyakta'. So, there is perhaps no absurdity, if these two categories are identified, and the contextual evidence seems to stand in favour of such identification.(3) The unevolved *Guna*, first of all, evolves itself into *sattva*, then from *sattva* arises *rajas*, and from *rajas* again arises *tamas*. Hence, an equilibriated state of the *gunas* is not the starting point in this theory of creation. There is prior state of potentiality, still more undifferentiated and undetermined than this one of triple alliance. All these modifications of *guṇa*, however, happen through the will of God. When the trinity is fully developed, there is still disturbance in the *guṇas*; but all parts of the three *guṇas* are not disturbed. Some parts of them form an equilibrium which is known as *Prakṛti* in the *Sāṃkhya*; and this *Prakṛti* part of the *Guṇas* is disturbed for the purpose of evolution of the world. This description of Nature is different from what is given in the classical *Sāṃkhya*. In the classical *Sāṃkhya*, the equilibriated state is the ultimate state and there is no other state prior to it. Moreover, this equilibriated state is infinite and all-pervading and creation takes place only in certain portions of this *avyakta*-state.

Puruṣa and Kāla:

Puruṣa and *kāla* are two other forms of God's power, besides *Prakṛti*; and they too are led to their respective functions in the process of creation by the thought power of *Viṣṇu* or *Nārāyaṇa*.

---

1. Ibid—Chap. 3. 31.
2. Ibid. 6. 7 & 8.
3. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā Chap. 3-28. 31.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Puruṣa:

The word *Puruṣa* is used here in a peculiar sense, meaning a collection or aggregate of selves, like cells in a honey-comb.(1) In essence, these selves are omniscient and all perceiving, being the special manifestations of God. But through the will of God, they become differently affected by *avidyā*, and thus they are made to suffer various kinds of afflictions and impurities which are the natural effects of ignorance. As a result of the veiling power of nescience, they lose their pure nature, become atomic and plunge deeply into this world of unbearable sorrows and pains.(2) These are really the *Jīvas* that suffer bondage and long for emancipation. Their infinite knowledge shrinks considerably, and so they can do little and know little. It is by the will of God that the impurities of ignorance, egoism, attachment, aversion, etc. are produced in them. Being afflicted by these *Kleśas*, these selves move from life to life in a cyclic order and thus suffer continuously till they attain salvation. Before descending into this world, these *puruṣas* first of all become associated with the power of God, and then with time and after that with the three *guṇas* in accordance with their order of development. The germs of all human beings (*manus*) are present in the *puruṣa*; and these *manus* are also, in essence, untouched by *kleśa* and *avidyā*, and are, therefore, omniscent like the unchangeable pure *puruṣa*. But through the will of God, they too become associated with afflictions and impurities of beginningless ignorance. By descending into this world in the forms of men, they suffer misery and strive for emanicipation. Thus, the word *puruṣa* here does not stand for a single *ātman*. It represents a stage in which the selves remain in collection through the desire of Lord *Viṣṇu*. A plurality of selves, therefore, is recognised in this *samhitā*, although they are supposed to remain together in a closely knitted pattern, forming thereby a collection or conglomeration. This state is called *puruṣa*(3). Further, in the classical *Sāṃkhya*, *puruṣa* is supposed to remain absolutely untouched and unaffected by desires and afflictions, but here the *puruṣas* are not supposed to remain above all impurities and *vāsanās*, though in themselves they are essentially pure.

1. Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā Chap. 7-1. 6. 33.
2. Ibid Chap. VI—35-36.
3. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā Chap VI-41.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Time or Kāla:

The category of time is described here, as the agency needed for the formation of the world. It is the principle that brings about the conjunction and the disjunction of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. Time also produces dissolution and it is described as the power that breaks up all things just as the force of the waves breaks the bank of a river.(1)

Prakṛti is the material cause that undergoes transformation for the production of all the categories inherent in it. *Puruṣa* is a non-transformable principle, but by its mere presence it creates an occasion for the transformation of Nature in time through the *Sudarśana-śakti* of God. Time is the factor that brings together *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* and thereby acts as the joining thread (or the principle of synthesis) in the sphere of creation. It is of a transcendental character and is responsible for the creation of the world. It is to be distinguished from time as moments which emerges from the *tāmasa* aspect of *mahat*. These three categories (*Puruṣa*, *Prakṛti* and *Kāla*) are recognised as the principles involved in the process of world-formation, but by themselves, they are not sufficient for this purpose. They are moved to action by *Viṣṇu-samkalapa* or the thought activity of God which, therefore, is the real dynamism operative in this act of creation.

Evolution:

The first evolute that emerges as a result of such tripartite union is called the *mahat*, which is also called by many other names, such as *vidyā*, *gauh*, *yavani*, *brāhmi*, *vadhu*, *vṛddhi*, *mati*, *madu*, *akhyāti*, *īśvara* and *prajñā*. The *Mahat* assumes the three-fold forms of *Kāla*, (time as moments) *buddhi* and *prāṇa*(2), according to the predominance of *tamas*, *sattva* and *rajas*. This *Mahat* is general intelligence and not an individual organ of intelligising activity, which also arises in the *Mahat*, with the descend of *manus* into it. The *sattva* side of the *Mahat* manifests itself as *dharma*, *jñāna*, *vairāgya* and *aiśvarya*, whereas the opposite qualities are manifested by the *tāmasa* aspect.

1. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā Chap. VI—51.
2. Ahirbudhnya Samihitā Chap—VII-9.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Further, through the influence of the thought-power of God, the *mahat* produces in it the category of *ahaṃkāra*. *Ahaṃkāra* too bears many names, e.g. *Abhimāna*, *Prajāpati*, *Abhimantā* and *Bodhā*, and it is of three kinds—*vaikārika*, *taijasa* and *bhūtādi*. With the development of *ahaṃkāra* from the *mahat*, *manus* descend into it, with all their previous equipments. From *ahaṃkāra* is produced first of all the organ of thinking of the *manus*, called *manas*. Thus, the *manus* become equipped with the power of thinking. The *śabda-tanmātra* arises from the *tāmasa ahaṃkāra* and from it arises the *ākāśa*. *Ākāśa* stands for empty space and it is associated with the quality of sound. When *Ākāśa* comes into being, the *manus* descend into this category and acquire further development in the direction of their physical existence.

The organs of speech and hearing arise from the *vaikārika ahaṃkāra* through the spiritual desire of God, and *manus* become associated with them. Then from the *tāmasa ahaṃkāra*, again, through the activity of God's thought power, the touch potential is evolved, and from it is produced air. Again, from *vaikārika ahaṃkāra*, the cognitive organ of touch and the conative organ of hand come into existence. The *manus*, therefore, become associated with these two newly evolved organs. From the *bhūtādi*, there arises again the *rūpa-tanmātra*, and from it arises the *tejas*. The *vaikārika ahaṃkāra* further produces the two organs of vision and movement, (eyes and feet). The *manus* at once become associated with these cognative and conative organs. From the *bhūtādi* through the spiritual-power of God, the taste potential is produced, and from it arises the element of water. Again the *vaikārika ahaṃkāra* produces two more organs of taste and sex and the *manus* become, further, enriched by them. The element of earth arises from the odour potential which arises from the *tāmasa-ahaṃkāra*. At this stage, from the *vaikārika-ahaṃkāra* arise two remaining organs of smell and secretion. The *manus* then descend into them and appear as full grown human beings. At the time of *Pralaya*, all these categories dissolve into *Prakṛti* in the inverse manner.

The peculiarity of this theory of evolution is that, here, at each stage of the emergence of a physical element, a conative sense and a cognitive sense develop and the selves by gradually descend-

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

ing into these categories, became thoroughly associated with the sense organs and the objects.

Kapila and Saṣṭitantra:

This philosophy of *Sāṃkhya* is attributed to *Kapila*, the writer of the *Saṣṭitantra*, in the '*Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*', and an enumeration of the names of these sixty tantras are also given in the twelvth chapter of this book. This *Saṣṭitantra* consists of two divisions or *mandals* of which the first consists of 32 and the second of 28 chapters. The first division is called the *Prakṛti mandal* which contains all the creative principles of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. The second division is called the *vikṛtimandal*, as the *vikṛitis* or modifications, which come into existence as a result of the functioning of these creative principles, are discussed in it. In the *Prakṛti mandal*, the first principle mentioned is *Brahman* and then *puruṣa* and then *Śākti* or the creative power of God. This arrangement and order may be taken as a justifiable ground for believing in the theistic character of the original *Sāṃkhya*, as it clearly points to a form of theistic philosophy with explicit recognition of a Supreme Being, besides *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. Other recognized principles are fate, time, the three *guṇas*, the *akṣara* (the changeless), the *prāṇas*, the *kartā* and *swāmi tantra*, the five organs of perception, the five of action, the five *tanmātras* and the five gross elements. Swāmi *tantra* perhaps stands for the topic on God. *Kartā Tantra* may be taken to refer to intelligence, egohood and mind, since these three internal organs by their joint action create the notion of a concrete phenomenal self (agent) enjoying all sorts of pleasures and pains (although no definite indication in this direction is available in the book). Most of the principles, discussed in this section, are dealt within the classical *Sāṃkhya* which, however, is dualistic and atheistic in its main outlook.

In the second section, (the *vikṛti mandal*) are mentioned first of all, the five *kṛtya-kāndas* which may be taken to stand for the five *karma yonayaḥ* (Springs at action) (1) of the *tattvasamāsa*; the second category is *Bhoga* and it may refer to the enjoyment of the fruits of actions, which spring from its five sources mentioned above. The third is called *Vṛtta-kānda* referring perhaps to the circular movements of creation and dissolution of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. Then come

1. Tattva-Samāsa—9.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the five types of afflictions (*Klesa*) which are very elaborately discussed in the philosophy of *yoga*. Recognition of the three *Pramānas* is mentioned under the next heading. *Khyāti, vairāgya, dharma, aiśvarya, guṇa linga, dristi, anusrāvika, dukha, siddhi, time, moksa,* etc. are the remaining '*Kāndas*' discussed in the '*ṣaṣṭitantra*'. Since all the chapters of '*Ṣaṣṭitantra*' are mentioned fully by the author of the *Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā*, we can say with greater conviction that the author of this book was personally acquainted with the contents of the '*Ṣaṣṭitantra*' and that his book, therefore, was truly written on the basis of *Kapila's* original teachings.

Conclusion:

This brief summary of the *Ahirbudhnya-Sāṃkhya* will clearly reveal to us the fact that it resembles in essential points all theistic *Sāṃkhya*-thoughts, advocated through the *vaiṣṇava* literatures. *Prakṛti* is believed to be the material cause of the world and all creative transformations are believed to take place through the instrumentality of time which connects *puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* together. *Puruṣa* is unchangeable and is involved in the conscious series of the evolutionary-flow. The unconscious series, however, is an emanation from *Prakṛti*. The actual mover of the trinity is God's spiritual power, which passes under the name of *Sudarśana-śakti* in the *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*. The triple categories are only its manifestations. So, God is the material cause and is also the teleological and the final cause of the universe because both the subject and the object spring forth from Him, and He draws the world towards Himself as the permanent abode of all values, things and beings. All '*Jīvas*' being emancipated, enter into the Supreme power of God which is known as the '*Parama-dhāma*' or the 'Highest destination'. That the highest reality is Lord *Viṣṇu*, who is in Himself beyond all impurities and yet by His power creates this universe of various things and beings, without being affected in any way, seems to be the common conception of the *vaiṣṇava-sāṃkhya*. All matter and phenomena are but His power and it is He who moves His power in the forms of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, through the functioning of time, for the projection of this colourful universe. It should, however, be remembered that *Prakṛti*, in all these contexts, does not stand for the inanimate matter of physical science. Being a form of God's

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

spiritual power, it is not fundamentally different from *Puruṣa* in essence. The thought and will power of God bifurcates itself into subject and object in the process of its self-relisation, and these subjective and objective aspects are represented respectively by *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* or spirit and matter. They are not therefore radically distinct in character, like *puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* of the classical *sāṃkhya*. Again, the postulation of thought and will power of God as the creative force is not illogical or dogmatic. It is really based on the evidence of human experience.

When an artist desires to paint a picture, he first of all forms in his mind an idea or image of the thing which he is going to reproduce on the canvas. Thus, the production of a new thing always presupposes the thought or idea of it in the mind of the agent which controls and guides his productive activity. But this idea arises at a particular moment and occupies the field of the artist's attention simply because he wills to have that idea at that point of time. So, there is always the precedence of will to thought or idea; and for the purpose of creation, a conscious being always uses his power of thought and will without which no kind of productive activity can be carried on. In the *Vaiṣṇava-sāṃkhya* this power of thought and will has been given a very prominent place, since it is the main tool in the hands of God with which the whole universe has been brought into being by Him.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

8th CHAPTER

A. *The Caraka-Samhitā—Different Senses of the Term Puruṣa and the Sense in which Caraka-Samhitā has used it:*

The atheistic line of thinking which has already been traced out in the teachings of *Pancaśika* in the *Mahābhārata* finds a fuller and more systematic development in the *Samhitā* of *Caraka*. Further logical development of this trend of thought has most probably led to the initiation of the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* by *Īśvara-kṛṣṇa*.

The first chapter of *Sārīra sthānam* in the *Caraka Samhitā* opens with an interpretation of different kinds of *puruṣa*. *Consciousness*, as such, is no doubt regarded as *puruṣa* in some '*śāstras*' but such *puruṣa* finds no place in medical science. Pleasure, pain, disease, death, old age, etc. can happen to a mind-body complex and not to pure transcendental *puruṣa*. So, by *puruṣa*, caraka refers to conglomerations of ingredients, either of six or of twenty-four. Further, for serving the purpose of *Caraka-samhitā*, human organisms alone are accepted in the sense of *Puruṣas*.(1)

Under 24 categories of which human organisms are formed, *caraka* includes eight *prakṛtis* and sixteen *vikāras*. Eight *Prakṛtis* are as follows:—

Five subtle *bhūtas*, *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *avyakta*. Sixteen *vikāras*, on the other hand, refer to five organs of sensation, five of action, mind and five *mahā-bhūtas*, with their specific qualities. The *Caraka samhitā* groups five subtle elements, *ahaṃkāra* and *buddhi* with *avyakta* and gives them the name *Prakrti* (most probably) on account of the fact that all of them are the causes of some other effects. This type of grouping can be found even at the time of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Gītā*. Causes are usually called '*Prakṛtis*' whereas the name *vikāra* denotes all those categories which are only the effects and not the causes of something else.

Sense Organs and the Acquisition of Knowledge:

Mind plays an important part both in the matter of acquisition and non-acquisition of knowledge, and it works through the senses.

1. Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthānam, Sūtra 14).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

In the absence of a contact with the mind, *ātmā*, *indriya* and *artha*, though placed in close proximity, fail to generate knowledge.(1) That is why, at a particular moment, a man can know only that thing which has drawn his mind towards itself, although his sense-organs may remain in touch with many other things. Our sense-organs are truly the instruments of knowledge. External sense-organs, first of all, come into contact with *viṣayas* and create indeterminate knowledge in alliance with the mind, which afterwards considers the merit and demerit of the object. Full determinate knowledge emerges when *Buddhi* comes to function, and then the decision is made by the self.(2) Thus, here we find clear recognition of the two stages of knowledge—indeterminate and determinate. Mind, in the opinion of *Caraka*, is both one and *atomic*.(3) Had it been of *Mahat parimāṇa* or had there been many minds, there would have been simultaneous knowledge of many things. As this does not occur, we are led to accept one-ness and atomic nature of *manas*. Regarding its function, we can say that the mind becomes the *adhiṣṭhātā* of *indriyas* and prevents itself from getting attached to harmful things. Each one of the five sense-organs is composed of five elements, but one of these five elements becomes prominent in a particular sense-organ.(4)

Organs of Action, Mahābhūtas and their Qualities:

Organs of action are also five in number. These perform the functions of speech, prehension, locomotion, evacuation and reproduction. Five *mahābhūtas* are *ākāsā*, air, fire, water and earth. Their qualities are sound, touch, colour, taste and smell.(5) *Ākāsā* possesses the quality of sound only, while both sound and touch are the attributes of air. Light arises with the properties of sound, touch and colour. The element of water possesses the qualities of sound, touch, colour and taste. The earth has all the five qualities of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. Hardness, liquidity, movement and heat are the signs of earth, water, air and fire, whereas the sign of *ākāsā* is openness or vacuity. All these qualities as well

1. Caraka Samhitā Śārīrasthānam-16-17.
2. Caraka samhitā Śārīrasthānam—20-21.
3. Ibid 17.
4. Caraka samhitā Śārīrasthānam—22.
5. Ibid—25.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

as their negation are perceptible with the help of the organ of touch.

Conglomeration of Categories and the Existence of the Abiding Self:

In the opinion of the *Caraka samhitā*, the conglomeration of the five *mahābhūtas*, the ten senses, five subtle elements, *manas*, *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *avyakta* makes up what we call man, through the influence of *rajas* and *tamas*. With the hightening of the *sattva guṇa* this conglomeration of categories ceases. All *karma*, knowledge, pleasure, pain, ignorance, etc. happen to this complex psycho-physical organism, and these are, therefore, enjoyable only in this worldly life.(1) But there is also the permanent self different from the non-spiritual elements, as otherwise the enjoyment of the fruits of action, bondage and liberation, birth and death, truth and false-hood will have no meaning. It is absurd to say that the pot can be produced without a potter or that a house can be built without a builder. One who says so, utters falsehood and suffers ignorance.(2) The self is not merely a series of changing states either; for in that case, for the work of one, others will be responsible which is unwise and unpalatable to our moral sense.(3) So, the recognition of a permanent self is absolutely necessary.

Elucidation of the Concept of Self:

This self is called the *Paramātman*, which is uncaused and beginningless. It is also eternal, unmanifest and unthinkable. Only the association of the self with the other elements, (which is called the *rāśi puruṣa*) is caused by will, ignorance, aversion and action.(4) Although consciousness belongs to the soul, it is not its essence (*svarūpaḥ*). All conscious states arise in the self only, when it enters into the conglomeration as one of its members. Otherwise, there is no consciousness in the self. The self cannot be directly perceived with the help of the sense-organs. It can only be known in its phenomenal aspect from the functions of desire, aversion, pleasure, pain, volition consciousness etc., which, therefore, serve as the signs

1. Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthānam)—35.
2. Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthānam)—41-42.
3. Ibid. 46.
4. Ibid—51, 57, 58.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

(*Lakṣaṇ*) of inference.(1) In the state of liberation, the *paramātman* becomes entirely dissociated from all these signs and, therefore, from consciousness too, which is only an emergent quality of the soul.(2) Since consciousness does not belong to the soul in its transcendental condition, knowledge, feeling and action also are the emergent qualities, that arise in the self as a result of its association with the body. The self becomes a knower, only when it functions through the instruments of the organs of cognition. (*Ātmā jñāh karaṇai jogāt jñānam tasya pravartate*). If these organs of cognition are not pure and clean, the knowledge that the soul gathers through them becomes impure and faulty.(3) The states of cognitions, affection and conation are, of course, manifested very often as objects of knowledge, but the *Paramātman* is never perceived as an object.

The Kṣetrajña and the Kṣetra:

This pure self(4) is called the *Kṣetrajña* when it gets connected with the aggregate of elements, composing the psycho-physical complex (*Kṣetra*). The relation between the *kṣetrajña* and the *kṣetra* (the conglomeration of psycho-physical elements) is beginningless, and it happens due to an accumulation of *rajas* and *tamas*, resulting from the performance of these two types of actions. Increase in the *sattva guṇa* unfastens the tie that binds the pure self with the mind-body system and thus prepares the way for its emancipation from the beginning-less cycle of births and deaths.(5) The *Caraka* view of *ātman* resembles to a certain extent the *Nyāya* view of it, as the *Naiyāikas* too hold that the soul, in itself, is unconscious and that it acquires the qualities of cognition, pleasure, pain and desire through its connection with the body. It is not a stream of consciousness, but an abiding substance which becomes conscious at times.

Empirical Selves and the Pure Self:

The pure self is immortal one and all pervading and it holds within it all the empirical selves or the individual egos which

1. Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthanam)—70.
2. Ibid 152, 153.
3. Ibid—53.
4. Caraka Samhita—(Śārīrasthānam)—63.
   Here, avyakta refers to the self and not to the basic principle (Prakṛti) of the world which cannot become the knower of any thing.
5. Ibid—34.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

function in association with their respective senses and the mind. Hence, there is a plurality of empirical selves while the transcendental self is one. Pleasure, pain and movements are attributed to the empirical self or the *samyogi-puruṣa*, which is directly in union with body and mind. The self, therefore, in its transcendental aspect, is detached from the senses and *manas* and is eternal and unchangeable, but in its empirical aspect, it is associated with the *manas* and the senses and is in the sphere of change and consciousness. It is in this phenomenal aspect that the self appears as the sufferer of physical ailments and it is the duty of the physician to remove all physical pains by the removal of its root cause, which (in the opinion of *Caraka*) is *upadhā* or desire.

The Category of Avyakta:

In the *Caraka-Samhitā*, *puruṣa* and *avyakta-prakṛti* are not separately mentioned by two distinct terms, but both of them are mentioned together and referred to by the same term, *avyaktam*.(1) *Avyaktam* seems to stand for both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*, and inspite of the fact, that *sanskṛit* is a very rich language, having an immense wealth of vocabularies, these basic principles are never mentioned distinctly and separately. This suggests that most probably the founder of this school of *Sāṃkhya* wanted to start with a mixed category, as the ultimate and unthinkable basis of this manifest universe, and that this category was, for him, a unified one of *Puruṣa* and *avyakta-prakṛti*. *Puruṣa*, perhaps, constitutes the upper or higher limit of this unified category, whereas the lower limit is *avyakta-prakṛti* or the changeable matrix of the world. *Avyakta-prakṛti* is the changeable aspect, whereas the *puruṣa*-state is the unchangeable phase of this basic category, always referred to as *avyaktam*. The use of this term in the neuter gender also suggests that this category stands neither for *puruṣa* alone, nor for *avyakta prakṛti* alone, but for a combined one of both, which is neither masculine or feminine. Again, had *avyakta* been pure and simple

1. (a) Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthānam)—59-60.

(The unthinkable pure self becomes the knower of the field, and is eternal, and all pervading. That which is different from this, is thinkable. Again, from another point of view, the whole of this psycho-physical world is vyaktam, but its basis, the ultimate 'avyaktam' is beyond sense perception and can be known only through inference. Here, 'avyaktam' in 'avyaktamātmā' is used definitely as an epithet of the self whereas in the sūtra 61, the same word seems to be used in the sense of avyakta-prakṛti (Khādini buddhiravyak-tamahaṃ-kārastathaṣṭamaḥ bhūtaprakṛtiruddiṣṭa...)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Mūla-Prakṛti, distinct and separate from *Puruṣa*, it would have been totally counted as a member of the *Kṣhetra*. But this has not been done in the *Caraka-Samhitā*. The *Kṣetra* is described as including also principles except 'avyakta' (1), and it is perhaps due to the fact that *avyakta* comprises within itself something other than pure matter, by virtue of which, it remains (specially in that aspect) outside the sphere of the *kṣetra*, which is a manifestation of the *prakṛti* part of this unified category.

Caraka and Pañcaśikha:

This conception of the ultimate category resembles to a great extent *pañcaśikha's* conception of *Puruṣā-vastham avyaktam* which, in the latter's opinion, constitutes the ultimate truth of the universe. In general outlines too, the account given in the *Caraka Samhitā* resembles very much the *Sāṃkhya* teachings of *Pañca-sikhāchārya*, as both of them believe that consciousness is an emergent quality of the soul, and that the psycho-physical elements carry on the process of life and work, without the help of *Iśvara* or God. Both of them believe in the existence of pure abiding self, which, in its phenomenal aspect, appears as the agent and also as the container of all psychical states. But in its pure form, in which it is dissociated from the sense organs and mind, it is devoid of all qualities and characteristics, and does not possess any *linga* or mark of inference. None of them believe that all ceases with death.

The Order of Emergence of Categories from the Avyakta:

The *Caraka-Samhitā* says that from this *avyakta prakṛti*, is derived the *buddhi*, from the *buddhi* arises the ego, and from the ego, the five elements and the senses are produced in their proper order.(2) When this production is complete, we say that creation has taken place. At the time of dissolution, all the evolutes return back to *avyakta*, whereas at the time of fresh creation, they become manifest again.

The State of Liberation:

Caraka holds that the state of liberation is a state of characterless existence.(3) In this state, the soul becomes absolutely dissocia-

1. Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthānam) 63.
   Here, 'Avyaktam' as 'Kṣetrajña' refers to the self.
2. The Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthānam) Sūtra 64.
3. Ibid—153-154.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

ted from its phenomenal covering, and transcends completely the sphere of Nature's influence. In other words, in the state of liberation, the soul attains *Brahmahood* and is no longer manifested in cognitions, emotions and conations. All attachments and actions, all feelings and knowledge, come to an absolute end. When *rajas* and *tamas* are fully uprooted and the fruits of actions are totally exhausted, there is a complete transcendance of 'body' by the Self. Since this state of the self is *avyakta*, the *Mokṣa* can only be described as a state of absolute ceasation (*Mokṣa nirvṛttiniḥśeṣa*), having no specific nature or character.

The Guṇas and Their Effects on Life and Actions:

Sattva, *rajas* and tamas, the three *guṇas* of the classical *Sāṃkhya*, have been viewed here as referring to three different mental states. *Rajas* and *tamas* represent the bad states of the mind (resulting in bad actions) and *sattva*, the good ones. Rajas and tamas, therefore, are the states which keep the self in bonadage, but *Sattva guṇa* helps *Jīvātman* to attain liberation. When rajas and tamas predominate, the mind becomes diseased and physical ailments arise from such mental diseases. It is, therefore, the duty of every person to keep 'rajas' and 'tamas' in a subdued condition, so that he may be blessed with a happy and prosperous life. He should not indulge too much in sex gratification and other passionate deeds, should control his greed, anger, fear, vanity and attachment, should be true to his words, and harmless in all his actions. If he follows such a right course of conduct, he will acquire merit (*dharma*) by virtue of which he will be able to live a well-balanced and healthy life with minimum sufferings of body and mind. *Dharma* and *adharma*, resulting from the performance of good and bad actions, are regarded by *Caraka*, as the most important regulative principles of this worldly life. Good and bad deeds fully determine not the nature of births of the *Jīvas* but also their specific physical features and intellectual equipments with which they are born. Hence full and effective control over the *rājasika* and *tāmasika* elements, involved in thought and action, is absolutely necessary for the interest of body, mind and spirit.

Atheism in Caraka:

Caraka-Samhitā does not believe in the existence of any principle which may be regarded as the guide and controller of the self.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Spirit is independent and it passes from one birth to another by dint of its own merit and demerit.(1) The self is perfectly free in the matter of choosing any particular line of action, but when that action has been performed, the soul has to enjoy or suffer its good or bad effects. The soul, thus, works according to its own free will and reaps the fruits of its own actions, good or bad. The law of *karma* with *dharma* and *adharma* determine and regulate the entire scheme of life in this world. There is no God or *Iśvara* to supervise and direct the flow of creation or evolution in any definite channel.

The *Caraka-Samhitā*, further, says that actions or effects are produced as a result of the collocation of the agent and other accessories. An action, therefore, is always the joint product of a conjunction of other conditions with the agent. Thus, pleasure, pain, desire, cognition, etc. arise in the soul when it gets associated with 'manas' and other organs. A potter cannot make a jug, unless he has the organs and other necessary materials with which to make it. In the practical life, the union of such accessories with the agent is generally being effected by the agent, but the union of self with the mind-body system is brought about by the law of *karma*, in co-operation with the soul's own merit and demerit, acquired in previous existence. No God is needed for this purpose.

Conclusion:

The *Caraka Samhitā*, thus, gives us a school of *Sāṃkhya*, different from the traditional theistic view; and the germs of this new thought-system can be traced in the *Mahābhārata*(2). The self in this view is neither pure consciousness, like the *Puruṣa* of the traditional and classical *Sāṃkhya*, nor does it remain wholly outside the sphere of phenomenal creation. It is not the reflection of pure consciousness that gets associated with the evolutes of Nature; but it is the self, itself, that becomes associated with the elemental conglomeration and appears as an individual human being. The subtle body of the soul, with the help of which it undergoes transmigration, is constituted of the fine particles of matter, although these particles

1. The Caraka Samhitā (Śārīrasthānam)—75.
2. The Mahābhārata (Sānti Parva) 218-219.
Pañcaśikha's teachings (already mentioned in the chapter on the Mahābhārata).

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

are not called *tanmātras* in the *Caraka Samhitā*. The encased self, therefore, is the agent and enjoyer, although its activities in all directions are performed through the instrumentality of *manas* and other necessary organs, forming the *Adhiṣṭhāna kṣetra* of all sorts of experience.

The concept of the ultimate category (as is already discussed in this chapter) is also peculiar, and is, on that account, different from the traditional *Sāṃkhya* concept. The ultimate category is neither the transcendental *puruṣa* nor the *guṇa mayee prakṛti*, but a mixed one of both the principles. The reason, perhaps, is this that the *Caraka-Samhitā* recognises a very close and intimate relation between body, mind and spirit, on ground of the fact that the spirit is the permanent principle in the physico-mental being, and that the physical and mental diseases occur concurrently in the life of an encased spirit. If this be so, then there should not be any unfathomable chasm (even at the root) between the self and the physico-mental principle, since both of them always appear in close intimacy in life and worldly existence. *Avyakta-prakṛti* is not isolated from the *Puruṣa* and the whole creation therefore proceeds from a conjoint principle, thereby cementing every conceivable gap between the biologico-psychological life and the life of the spirit. Thus, this *samhitā* gives us a plain and clear form of atheistic *Sāṃkhya*, although the dualistic element is implicit in it. *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* are not two distinct and independent principles, with any unbridged gulf between them. They remain united and form one category, which lies at the root of this vast universe. This system is not monistic(1) either, as it does not postulate one principle as the ultimate Reality.

B—BUDHA-CARITA:

Aśvaghosa's Buddha Carita may, perhaps, be taken as a further development of the dualistic *Sāṃkhya*. Here, perhaps, for the first

1. We cannot describe this system as monistic, since it does not recognize 'avyakta-prakṛti' as forming ondyan aspect or power of one ultimate principle. These two (spirit and matter) seem to be distinct, but Prakṛti is not most probably independent, as it seems to reside in the womb of Puruṣa, which constitutes the upper limit of the unified whole. Moreover, caraka is very fond of accepting everything as a conglomeration of different elements. Hence, it is not improbable to suppose that his ultimate category is also a conglomeration of two principles, and not one only without a second.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

time, two principles like *kṣetra* and *kṣetrajña* or matter and individual spirit are explicitly recognized. The most important passage in this book, for our purpose, is the conversation between *Arāda* and the future *Buddha*. This *Arāda* seems to be a teacher of the *Sāṃkhya*-philosophy; and though the name of *Sāṃkhya* has not been mentioned in the book, the name of *Kapila* is clearly mentioned. (XII-21)(1).

Arāda, first of all, makes a distinction between *prakṛti* and *vikṛti* and says that the former group consists of five elements, the *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *avyakta*. By *vikṛtis*, however, he means the objects of senses, the hands, and feet, the voice, the organs of generation and excretion and also the mind. The eight fold *Prakṛti* and *Vikṛti* make up what is called the *Kṣetra* and the self that is conscious of this *Kṣetra* is called the *Kṣetrajña*.(2) Hence, unlike *Caraka*, *kṣetrajña* and *prakṛti* are mentioned, here, as two different and distinct principles, although they are related to each other. The transcendental and the phenomenal aspects of *Atman* are not clearly distinguished, and the self is here described more as an individual than as the all pervading universal spiritual principle of the world. Nevertheless, *kṣetrajña* has been definitely mentioned as a distinct principle over and above the 24 categories of material world. Herein lie the seeds of dualism, which flourish afterward in the *Sāṃkhya kārikā* of *Iśvarakṛṣṇa*.

The *Buddha-carita* holds that the causes of the cycle of existence are to be sought in wrong knowledge, wrong attribution of personality, confusion of thought, lack of discrimination and attachment. Five forms of ignorance are mentioned in this book and these are torpor, delusion, great delusion and the two kinds of darkness.(3) The bound *puruṣa*, conjoined with this five—fold ignorance, glides from birth to birth and suffers pain. The cycle of transmigration can be transcended by one, who possesses right knowledge of the group of four, the intelligent, the unintelligent, the manifest and the unmanifest.(4)

1. The Buddha Carita Chap. 12, 21.
2. Ibid—12, 18, 19, 20.
3. The Buddha-Carita Chap. 12-33.
4. Ibid—Chap. 12-40.

* Prakṛti is used in the singular because the author of Buddha—carita thinks that there is a unity underlying the group of eight. The difficulty of pluralism is thus avoided.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The state of liberation is described as the state of the supreme absolute, which is without a characteristic, everlasting and unchangeable. When the knower escapes permanently from the body, like the bird from its cage, he gently flows into this state of the Absolute and goes beyond sufferings and ignorance.(1) Here, the epithet *Supreme Absolute*, without attribute, everlasting and immutable may suggest the idea of a "Supreme Divinity" as the highest principle of this universe. But since this has been described as the state which the learned men, who know the principles, call liberation, it seems to us to be more rational and cogent to describe it as the '*Mokṣa*' state, which, in the opinion of *Arāda*, is a characterless existence, in which the soul attains *Brahmahood* and is not associated with cognitions, emotions, etc. The immediately succeeding lines too express the view that the state of liberation and the means for attaining it have been fully discussed in the preceding verses, but no mention of a personal divinity as the highest reality is made in this context. Lord *Buddha* too, while expressing his disbelief in the theory, criticises the doctrine of soul and its liberation but does not make any remark on "Supreme Divinity". *Arāda* was perhaps acquainted with the philosophy of *Caraka* and it is not unlikely that he derived this idea of a characterless state of liberation from his philosophy. So, his teaching may in all probability be regarded as a form of atheistic *Sāṃkhya* that can be placed in line with the atheistic teachings of *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka*.

An important feature of *Arāda's* teachings detailed in the canto XII of this book, is the omission of the three *guṇas*, which play such an important role in the Classical *Sāṃkhya*. The reason for such omission is not, however, clear. It may be due to the fact that the acceptance of the three *guṇas* in the sense of the ultimate constituents of the psycho-physical world, is made first of all in the classical *Sāṃkhya*. In the pre-*kārikā Sāṃkhya*, the three *guṇas* were generally described as standing for three different psychical states. Each was again sub-divided into a number of varieties. The forms of births & rebirths were believed to depend wholly on the functioning of these mental states. The *Buddha-carita*, on the other hand, advocates that the three causes of the cycle of exis-

1. (Buddha-Carita) Chap. 12, 65, 66.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

tence are the power of the act, wrong knowledge and desire. *Arāda*, therefore, gives us a full description of these causes only and not of the *guṇas*, which do not seem to occupy here any important place in the process of creation or transmigration.

CONCLUSION

SECTION—A

The Three Stages in the Evolution of the Sāṃkhya School of Thought:

We have so far explored the possible sources of the philosophy of *Sāṃkhya*. It is now necessary to trace the different stages, through which this particular school of thought has passed, before attaining its classical form. At one stage in the history of the *Sāṃkhya*-system, its advocates traced it to the *upaniṣads*. *Brahma-sūtras* of *Bādrāyana* are clear evidence of this fact, since in and through many of the *sūtras*, the author tried to refute the arguments of some *Sāṃkhyāists*, who seemed to hold the view that the *Sāṃkhya*-system was the teaching of the *Upaniṣadic* philosophy. Of course, there is a difference of opinion, regarding the view whether the *upaniṣadic* doctrines are, in spirit, idealistic and monistic or realistic and dualistic but here is no denying of the fact that there are some passages in the *upaniṣads*, which do admit of a dualistic interpretation. These passages were not, however, interpreted in their proper spirit by the monistic thinkers, with the result that the reality and independence of the world was wholly denied.

The *Sāṃkhya*-system, in all probability, seems to have arisen as a reaction against this monistic bias. According to Maxmuller, in the *Upaniṣadic* period, the monistic and idealistic doctrines were, indeed, more prevalent than the doctrines of realism and dualism; and the formulation of the *Sāṃkhya*-philosophy was,—to quote his own words,—"a kind of toning down of the extreme Monism of the *Advaita-vedānta*"(1). Garbe also says (in his *Sāṃkhya*-Philosophy) that 'the foundation of the *Sāṃkhya* Philosophy is to be sought in a reaction against the propagation of the consistent idealism which began to be proclaimed with enthusiasm'. Realism and dualism are generally more popular than

1. Six Systems of Indian Philosophy (Series) Volume three (Sāṃkhya and yoga) Page—15.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

monism and idealism and an over-emphasis on the idealistic and monistic elements perhaps led to the formulation of the dualistic doctrine of the *Sāṃkhya*-school. The *Sāṃkhya* philosophers were in a more advantageous position than the *Advaitins* since they postulated 'nature' as a separate principle, and also allowed to individual selves an independent character. It should, however, be remembered that all these dualistic ideas and thoughts of the *Sāṃkhya* system were not anti-*Upaniṣadic*; on the contrary, they were nourished and made to yield a good harvest of philosophical doctrines by the teachings of the *Upaniṣadic* thinkers. The *Sāṃkhya* had, undoubtedly, its origin in the *Upaniṣads*, like the *Vedānta* system of *Śaṃkarāchāryya*.

Originally, the *Sāṃkhya*-system seems to have derived its name from *Sāṃkhya* (number); and interpreted in that sense, the philosophy of *Sāṃkhya* simply meant an enumeration of the categoies of the evolutionary series. Thus, *Prakṛti* was regarded as the basic cosmic principle and mind, *buddhi*, sense-organs, etc. were supposed to be derived from it. But when this particular branch of philosophical thinking became more systematic, it meant a rational enquiry for truth and knowledge, and not merely an enumeration of the categories of Nature. The *Sāṃkhya* philosophers had always argued rationally for establishing their dualistic position, and had never accepted anything as truth, simply because it was mentioned in the "Śruti". So, the emergence of this system in the history of Indian Philosophy meant a greater prominence for reasoning, as well as a lessening of importance for Revelation as a source of knowledge.

The atheistic approach of the classical *Sāṃkhya* together with its initial pessimism, often raises the problem,whether the *Saṃkhya*-view was borrowed from the *Buddhistic* philosophy or not. Historical evidence (as far as we have been able to collect) goes to prove that both the *Vedānta* and the *Sāṃkhya*-thoughts, in original forms, existed before the rise of *Buddhism*. Mr. Garbe in his *Sāṃkhya philosophy* has stated that the *Sāṃkhya* belonged to the pre-buddhistic age. *Buddha-carita*, which gives an elaborate exposition of the *Sāṃkhya*-thoughts by *Ārāda*, the former teacher of Lord Buddha,—also proves the prior existence of the *Sāṃkhya*-ideas. But during the pre-Buddhistic era, the thoughts and ideas of the *Sāṃkhya*-school

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

were not systematically and rationally knitted together to form a regular system of philosophy. Moreover, these thoughts were mainly of a theistic character. It was only after the formulation of *Buddhism* which challenged the reality of permanent substance, that the *Sāṃkhya*-thoughts were systematically developed to form a regular system, with a leaning towards atheism. (Since in the opinion of this school, the existence of God could not be proved by rational arguments and logical thinking).

Kapila, the reputed founder of the *Sāṃkhya*-system, most probably belonged to an age not later than 700 B.C. In the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, *Kapila* is mentioned as an incarnation of God, and the same view is found also in the *Bhagavad-gītā*. He is mentioned, there, as the first in the line of the perfected souls.(1) A detailed account of his parentage is available in the *Bhāgavata*. *Kapila* is mentioned here, as the son of the sage, *Kardama* by his wife *Devahuti*. There is an account, in this *purāṇa*, of the religious discourse of *Kapila* to *Devahuti*, by which the son imparted to his mother, the knowledge of the theistic *Sāṃkhya*. Prof. S. N. Das Gupta has stated in his History of Indian Philosophy that this *Kapila* of *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* seems to be the founder of the *Sāṃkhya* "in the absence of any proof to the contrary". (2) *Kārikā* 70 places *Āsuri* next to *Kapila*, and both *Āsuri* and *Pañcaśikha* are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* as teacher and pupil in the *Sāṃkhya* system of thought. Although *Asuri* is regarded as the direct disciple of *Kapila*, we do not know anything about him. *Pañcaśikha* probably modified *Kapila's* work in atheistic light, as is evident from the study of the *Mahābhārata*. Prof. S.N. Das Gupta has also stated in the first volume of his History of Indian Philosophy, that if we believe the *Ṣaṣṭitantra* referred to in the *Ahirbudhnya Samhita* to be in all essential parts, the same work which was composed by *Kapila* and based faithfully on his teachings, then it has to be assumed that *Kapila's Sāṃkhya* was theistic. It seems probable that his disciple *Āsuri* tried to popularise it. But it seems that a great change occurred when *Pañcaśikha*, the disciple of *Asuri*, came to deal with it..... *Pañcaśikha* probably modified *Kapila's* work in an atheistic way and

1. The Gita—Chap. 10-26.
2. History of Indian Philosophy—Vol. IV—Page 36.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

passed it as *Kapila's* work (1). The *Kārikā* 70 also speaks in favour of this view. (*Tena bahudhā kṛtam tantram*).

Hence, in view of all these facts, we can divide our study of the history of the *Sāṃkhya* into three stages:—First, a theistic and monistic stage, which preserves in itself the spirit of the *upaniṣads*; second, an atheistic and semi-dualistic stage, represented by *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka*; and the last one is a stage of atheism and full-fledged dualism, as sketched in the *Arāda-Sāṃkhya*, the *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* of *Iśvarakṛṣṇa* and the *Sāṃkhya-Sūtra*.

The Theistic and Monistic stage in the Upaniṣads in the form of Scattered and Fragmentary Thoughts:

The early stage of the *Sāṃkhya* may be traced back to the *upaniṣadic* age, when the elements and ideas of this particular system remained only in a nabulous state. The reality of *Prakṛti*, the plurality of *Purusas*, the evolution of the categories, are, indeed, admitted in the *Upaniṣads*; but they are not systematically developed to form a regular thought-system. The central doctrine of the *Upaniṣads* is, of course, absolute idealism, which seeks to establish the identity of the individual self with the absolute self; but there are passages in the *upaniṣads*, which definitely allow a certain reality to the phenomenal world, since it is an emanation from God. *Annam* is the stuff and basis of our environment. It creates life and sustains and makes sprightly the whole universe. In the Chap. on the *Upaniṣads*, it has already been shown, how this *Annam* can stand for *Prakṛti* with its power of ceaseless production. But this material principle in the *Upaniṣads* is not independent and absolute. It is a form of Brahman or it has evolved from Brahman which is the ultimate truth and reality. Again, there are passages in the *Upaniṣads*, which admit the existence of the individual soul over against the supreme soul, with a reality of its own; and the result is the plurality of individual souls. These individual souls are the experiencers of pleasures and pains; and they, being enveloped with the *guṇas*, pass from birth to birth in a cyclic order, in accordance with the immutable law of *Karma*. Of course, the *Upaniṣads* have always attempted to maintain the theistic position, but this division

1. History of Indian Philosophy—Vo. I—Page 221

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

of the *Ātman* into supreme and individual self has ultimately led to the abolition of the supreme soul, which is supposed to derive its vital energy solely from the *Ātman*, existing in the *Jīva*. So, theism in the *Upaniṣads*, in course of time, gave way to atheism and the creative energy was transferred to *prakṛti*,—the supposed matrix of the whole universe. *Annam* or *Prakṛti* is also supposed to be prior to individual *puruṣas* in existence, and in this sense, Nature becomes independent of the individual souls. With God disappearing, *Prakṛti* becomes the sole dynamic or creative principle of the world and instead of the trinity of God, universe and individual soul, we have the dual principles of *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*,—the minimum supposition of the classical *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, of course, protests against such atheistic attitude by asserting in so many verses the existence of a divine power, (1) but all these arguments have become superfluous in view of its strong dualistic leaning. Even then we may not be wrong in saying that the real tendency of the *Upaniṣads* was always to create atmosphere of theism and monism; and in view of this, a sincere endeavour to subordinate the dualistic concepts and ideas to some sort of theism is remarkably present in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*.

With *Prakṛti*, individual *puruṣas* and God as the basic principles, the *Sāṃkhya* of the *Upaniṣads* may be summarised, from the scattered elements, in the following manner. The *Avyakta-prakṛti* is the cause that evolves the world in a series of categories, like *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra*, *manas*, etc. This cause is endowed with the three *guṇas*(2) which stand for 3 elements (3) of Nature. All things of the universe are composed of them. (Both the *Chānd.* and the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣads*, however, mention these three *guṇas* as red, white and black colours, and the names *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* do not occur, until the *Maitrāyani Upaniṣad* which gives us a more developed account of the *Sāṃkhya*-system.). The individual souls or the spirits, after falling in the enticing snare of *Prakṛti*, enjoy the fruits of their

1. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad—
   6—10.
   4—10.
   4—11.
   4—12.
2. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad—4.5
3. Chānd. Upaniṣad VI—4.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

various actions; but if a soul can free itself from the bonds of Nature, it ceases to flow into any other worldly-state and passes beyond pleasures and pains. A freed soul regains the status of the pure soul and is no longer stirred by passions or desires. But when the pure self gets entangled in the network of the three *guṇas*, it becomes the phenomenal self and suffers misery and pain. In this state of bewilderment, the self does not see the Lord dwelling within itself. "Born along and soiled by the stream of *guṇas*, uncertain, unstable, bereft of all true knowledge, full of desires and forlorn, it becomes subject to self-consciousness".(1) (Eng. trans. E. B. Cowell).

But both the individual self and *Prakṛti* are modes of God and are, therefore, dependent on Him. It is this supreme spirit that gives start to the process of creation and orders all things. Individual souls are nothing but the sparks of God and have, therefore, no existence apart from Him. The different categories are also mentioned in their proper order in the *Katha-upaniṣad*. Objects, senses, mind, intellect, the great self, undeveloped and the spirit are all the categories, needed for the creation of this universe. (*Tanmātras*, however, were mentioned for the first time, in the *Maitrāyani-Upaniṣad*). The mind-body system is not intelligent in itself. It is the spirit that intelligises this sytem. The intellect easily reflects the consciousness of the self, because it is transparent and next to the self. "By him—the intelligent—is this body made to appear intelligent".(2) The process of dissolution of all things in the 'imperishable' in the reverse order is also mentioned in the *Upaniṣads*.

The theory of *Sat-kārya-vāda* is also present in a less developed form in the *Upaniṣads*. The dialogue between *Uddālaka* and *Śvetaketu* in the 6th Chapter of the *Chānd. Upaniṣad* may be mentioned in this context. There, it is clearly stated that the cause and the effect are identical in essence. The effect is nothing but the cause transformed. Names and forms are valid empirically, because they render valuable service in practical life. But metaphysically considered, names and forms are mere words,—the real thing is the cause. But the most remarkable characteristic of the *Upaniṣadic* philosophy

1. Maitrayani—3.2.
2. Maitrāyani—2-5.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

lies in the fact that it has always admitted the existence of the supreme principle of synthesis or God. One spirit is conceived of as existing here and there, in rivers and seas, in flowers and trees in the phenomena as well as noumena. He maintains the outer as well as the inner order. In short, He forms the very substratum of all things and beings.

The *Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad*, upholding 'Unity' as ultimate says: "It is the self-same one who exists alone at the time of creation and dissolution of the universe, that assumes manifold powers and appears as the Divine Lord by virtue of His inscrutable *Māyā*. He, it is, that projects all the worlds and controls all the various forces, working therein. Those who realise this Being become immortal"(1). It has also been asserted that it is the divine power that lies hidden in its own *guṇas*, that the threads of the web of Nature emanate from God and that the entire nature is nothing but the creative power of God, who alone is the Supreme Being, independent and uncaused. In the *Maitrāyani Upaniṣad*, (we have already seen) the unmanifested is described as the mouth of the spirit. Hence the *Upaniṣadic Sāṃkhya* does not advocate the independent existence of Nature or *Prakṛti*. In fact, the *Sāṃkhya* concepts and ideas, in this stage, develop in a theistic setting. Individual souls and *Prakṛti* are emanations from a common principle and are not therefore radically distinct. The subject and object are independent of each other but dependent on God—the Supreme Source of the whole creation.

The Theistic Sāṃkhya of Kapila developed into the Doctrine of the Vaiṣṇava Cult:

In the chapter on the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, we have already taken into consideration the difference of opinion about the historical existence of Kapila,—the founder of the *Sāṃkhya*-system. Garbe believes that the traditionally handed down name of Kapila cannot be regarded as mythical and fictitious. Prof. S. N. Das Gupta also appears to believe in the historical existence of Kapila. In his 'History of Indian Philosophy' (Vol. I) he seems to speak in favour of the view that the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*, referred to in the *Ahirbudhnya-*

1. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad—3-1.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Samhitā was composed by Kapila, and that this fact justifies the assumption that Kapila's doctrine was theistic in character. The *Ṣaṣṭitantra* (mentioned in the *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*) consists of two divisions. The first division is called the *Prakṛti-mandal* and it enumerates the creative principles of *Sāṃkhya*-philosophy. The second one is known as *Vikṛti-mandal* and it contains all the modifications, that emerge as a result of the operation of these creative principles. Brahman is regarded as the Supreme Principle and *Puruṣa* and *Śakti* (creative power) are the manifestations of this *Supreme* Being. Evidently, therefore, the philosophy that has been propounded in the *Ṣaṣṭitantra* is theistic in form and spirit.

In the *Mahābhārata* too, it is stated that the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy advocates the supremacy of one transcendental *puruṣa*, the great *Nārāyaṇa* who is beyond the sphere of the *Guṇas* and who is also the ultimate ground of all subjective and objective phenomena of the world.(1) He behaves as the cosmic ruler in His four-fold forms of *Vāsudeva, Samkarṣaṇa, Aniruddha* and *Pradyumna*. Prof. Radhā Krishnān has also said that "the earliest form of *Sāṃkhya* was realistic theism like the qualified monism of the *Upaniṣads*".(2) The *Bhāgavata Purāna* gives us a detailed account of the sage Kapila and his philosophy, that he imparted to his mother. Prof. S. N. Das Gupta has said, "In the absence of any proof to the contrary, it may be assumed that the account of *Sāṃkhya* attributed to *Kapila* in the *Bhāgavata*, may generally be believed to be true."(3) The theistic *Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavata* believes *Prakṛti* to be the cause of this variegated universe, and this creative principle is moved into action through the influence of time, by the will and thought of *Viṣṇu* or the transcendental *puruṣa*. *Prakṛti* is not an independent principle. It is simply the creative power of God, and as such it is also called the *Māyā-śakti* of the transcendental *puruṣa*. God, on His own initiative, reflects Himself in *māyā*, and thereby, vitalises it and makes it ready for creation. This *Māyā* contains the three *guṇas* and is also unmanifest, eternal and homogeneous. The act of disturbing the equilibrium of *Prakṛti* takes place through the instrumentality of Time. Time exists in God as His transcendent power and

1. The Mahābhārata.
2. Indian Philosophy Vol. II p. 253.
3. History of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV p. 36.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

effort. The *Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavata* also contains an account of the evolutionary series, and all these have been discussed in details,—in the chapter on the said *Puraṇa*.

The most remarkable characteristic of the *Bhāgavata Sāṃkhya* is its inclination towards the idealistic doctrine of the *vedānta* philosophy. By describing the finite selves as so many forms of the reflected image of one *Puruṣa*, the *Bhāgavata Sāṃkhya* joins hands with the idealistic thinkers of the *Vedānta* faith. The ultimate reality is also described as beginningless pure and self-shining. This perhaps points towards the fact that in the original state, the *Sāṃkhya* ideas were not rigidly isolated from the *vedāntic* thoughts. The *Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavatas*, however, have spoken strongly in favour of devotion (towards God) which with knowledge and renunciation as means, will surely lead to final emancipation. All these evidences may be collected for establishing the view that the Sāṃkhya, as taught by its founder Kapila, was theistic, and that this theistic vein is still preserved in the *acintya-bhedāveda-vāda* of the *vaiṣṇava* school. (The *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā* has stated clearly that *Kapila* was a philosopher of the *vaiṣṇava* cult).

The Theistic Stage as developed in the Mahābhārata and the Gītā:

The *Sāṃkhya* in the epic and the *Gītā* was not very systematically construed and therefore seems to be in the process of formation only, side by side with other philosophical systems. The most common view of the *Sāṃkhya* that has been discussed in several chapters of the *Śānti-Parvan* in the *Mahābhārata*, is no doubt theistic; but an atheistic account is also present in the teachings of *Pañcaśikha*. While in the classical *Sāṃkhya*, *Prakṛti* is regarded as an ultimate principle, it is not so in the epic, which admits *Puruṣottama* as the highest category. *Prakṛti*, no doubt, is the dynamic principle, but its evolution and dissolution take place under the supervision of the highest spiritual principle. Both *Prakṛti* and individual souls are in the 'Highest Being' and He alone is ultimate and Absolutely Real. All distinction and difference exist between Nature and the individual *puruṣa*. The Supreme Reality is one. *Prakṛti* consists of the three *guṇas*—*Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*,—and all objects of the world are regarded as their products. These are also the three factors that

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

envelop *puruṣa*, like dust and smoke. Due to the existence of these *gunas*, the soul suffers misery and delusion. (The *gunas*, however, are referred to as representing different psychical states—good, bad and indifferent). The distinction of spirit as inactive and Nature as active is recognized in the *Mahābhārata*. Although *Prakṛti* creates everything, yet it cannot do so, without the guidance of the Highest spiritual principle.(1) The categories are also mentioned in the epic philosophy, but all the twenty-four categories of the orthodox-*Sāṃkhya* in their classical order of development are not present. The souls, so long as they are in union with nature, are many in number; but as soon as the mist of *avidyā* is changed into knowledge, the *jīva-souls* merge into the 26th principle which shines, for ever as the ultimate reality. All these points have been dealt with earlier in the chapter on the *Mahābhārata* and there, particular stress is laid on the theistic attitude of the epic philosophy, which is lacking in the classical *Sāṃkhya*. Nevertheless, the opposition between Nature and individual souls, and the evolution of the empirical world from the womb of *Prakṛti*, are present in the epic. Of course, there are divergent expositions of these problems in the *Mahābhārta*; still, even in the midst of these divergencies, all agree with regard to the exposition of *Puruṣottama* or *Īśvara*. The Absolute Being, working in men, includes within Himself their psychical and physical organisations. The free soul meditating on His true essential nature, regains everlasting peace and happiness, and does not migrate any longer.

Again, in the epic philosophy, three schools of *Sāṃkhya* are mentioned.(2) One school admits the existence of 24 categories; the second school admits the existence of 25 categories and the third believes in the existence of 26 categories. The last school is the exponent of the theistic *Sāṃkhya*, and the predominant thought of the *Mahābhārata* seems to move in this direction. We have already mentioned *Pañcaśikha's Sāṃkhya* as atheistic and implicitly dualistic; and this school admits the existence of 24 categories. *Caraka*, too, is a representative of this school. As an exponent of 25 principles, we may mention the name of *Arāda* who has admitted

1. The Mahābhārata—314-11-12.
2. The Mahābhārata—XII-318-71, 72.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

the existence of 8 *Prakṛtis*, 16 *vikāras* and *kṣetrajña* or individual soul that resides in the body. The classical *Sāṃkhya* also belongs to this last school which proclaims the existence of 25 principles. The *Mahābhārata* denounces the first two schools (the schools of 24 and 25 categories) as unsatisfactory and adheres to that school which believes in the existence of the 26 principle.(1) The *Mahabharata* also refers to the philosophies of *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* as *Sanātana dve* (two ancient systems).(2) They were not, perhaps, separated at that time. In the epic philosophy, the *Sāṃkhya* is also mentioned as the highest truth with a belief in God as the 26th principle, in addition to 25 categories, recognized in the classical *Sāṃkhya*.

In the *Gītā*, however, the word *Sāṃkhya* has been used more in the sense of true knowledge than in the sense of *Kapila-Sāṃkhya* or any other form of the *Sāṃkhya*-thought. *Sāṃkhya* here means the path of philosophic wisdom, leading to the realisation of the essential nature of the *Ātman*. The *Prakṛti* in the *Gītā* means the lower nature of God and is never an independent principle, as in the classical *Sāṃkhya*. It is called *Aparā Prakṛti* (Chap. 7) and is differentiated into eight parts (viz., the five elements, the *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *manas*), probably showing, thus, that the physical and the psychical have evolved together to form the mind-body system. The Highest Reality is the all-inclusive God and He includes within Himself both *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. They simply stand for His higher and lower natures, and are, therefore, totally dependent on God. God's superior nature contains living souls and by this superior nature, the whole world is sustained and invigorated. Hence, the *Gītā* says that *Puruṣottama* is the ultimate cause of this universe. The three *guṇas* and all their products are grounded in Him. The *Gītā* also recognizes the duality between the *Kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña* (nature and invididual soul), but this duality is ultimately reconciled, as both the principles are absorbed within the all-inclusive nature of God. Through these two natures God creates and sustains and ultimately dissolves this vast universe of things and beings. Both *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* are to be regarded as beginningless. The *guṇas* and all their modifications are the products of Nature. The *guṇas* are, however, not viewed as the

1. Ibid—XII—318-73, 74 & 80.
2. The Mahābhārata—Chap. 12. 349-73.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

elements of *Prakṛti*. They are the products of Nature (*Prakṛti-Sambhabāh*). They actually form our experience-stuff. These are regarded as the universal characteristics of our psychical states and processes, and as such they are also the springs of action.

The entanglement of the *Kṣetrajña puruṣa* in *Prakṛti*, through ignorance, is the cause of the self's experience of pleasure and pain. The soul identifies itself with nature through ignorance and, thus, plunges deeply into misery and pain. He who knows the distinction between the *Kṣetrajña Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, along with its *gunas*, attains emancipation. Thus, while in the clasical *Sāṃkhya*, *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* are regarded as two independent and ultimate principles, it is not so in the *Gītā*, which admits the existence of the *Absolute* or the "All Inclusive Spiritual Being," as the first principle and holds that all other things have emanated from this Supreme category. In the 13th chapter of the *Gītā*, we do find an enumeration of twenty-four categories, but these are not the same as the categories of the classical *Sāṃkhya*. The five tanmātras also have not been mentioned in the *Gītā*. Nevertheless, the *Bhagavad Gītā* does give us an outline of the earlier *Samkhya* in its theistic setting. The *Gītā* does not seem to make any distinction between *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga*; but these two terms are not used here in the sense of the traditional *Sāṃkhya-yoga* philosophy. They seem to be used in the sense of *Karma-Sannyāsa* and *Karma Yoga*, and in these senses, they are associated together. The *Gītā* says that ignorant people only think that *Sāṃkhya* and yoga are different, but the wise men always realise fully the unity between the two.

The theistic *Sāṃkhya* of the *Mahābhārata* as well as of the *Gītā* represents the early form of the *Kapila Sāṃkhya* imbued with the spirit of the *Upaniṣadic* philosophy. The *Purāṇas* as well as the *Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā* of the *Vaiṣṇava*-cult preserve and nourish, in and through their philosophical doctrines, the spirit of the original *Sāṃkhya*.

The Purāṇas and the Manusmṛti*:

The Purāṇas believe in the existence of one infinite eternal and unborn God who may be called either *Viṣṇu* or *Maheśvara*. *Puruṣa*,

*The Purāṇas, discussed here are the following:—
The Viṣṇu Purāṇa, the Kurma Purāṇa, the Markandeya Purāṇa and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Prakṛti and *Kāla* are His different forms. *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* are independent of each other and remain separate before creation. Through the instrumentality of Time, these two are brought together by the will of the Supreme category, and creation of the universe proceeds therefrom. But the dual principles of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* and also their conjunction spring forth from the playful motive of God. Duality is not therefore final. The ultimate Reality is one only without a second. All things and beings living in water, on land and in the sky are simply the manifestations of that Great Being. This Highest principle is without any attribute, yet it can operate as a creative agent by virtue of its unthinkable (*acintya*) power. God alone is the ultimate reality and He spontaneously manifests Himself in all sights and sounds. He Himself is the *Jīva* inasmuch as He is the Great Soul. The brilliance of the snow-covered mountain, the radiant glow of the setting sun, the cool breeze of summer, and the charming scenery of the evening cloud, are the living forms of that Great *Puruṣa*, who in Himself is very charming and exquisitely beautiful. In other words, all that we see, hear, feel, taste and touch, are the glories of God, and are created out of Himself. Such being the general stand of the *Purāṇas*, it may be reasonably inferred that the *Sāṃkhya* system, built on the basis of these materials, was theistic in form and character.

In the *Manusmṛti* also, there is an elaborate discussion on the character of the three *guṇas*, but the word *Sāṃkhya* is not mentioned in it. The three *guṇas*, however, received the same type of interpretation, as was customary in the pre-*kārikā Sāṃkhya*-philosphy. Like the *Sāṃkhya*, the *Manusmṛti* also mentioned three sources of knowledge. All these facts prepare the ground for holding the belief that, perhaps, Manu too was not immune from the influence of the *Sāṃkhya* thought.

The Theistic Stage as developed in the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā :

The *Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā* records a further development of the theistic *Sāṃkhya* of *Kapila*, and as such, in this *Vaiṣṇava* literature too, *Viṣṇu* is regarded as the Supreme category ruling over life and non-living things. He dwells in the sun, in the moon, in stars and lightning, in wind and water, and remaining free and non-

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

attached, He exerts influence over everything through His active power or will. He is beginningless, endless, eternal, devoid of all forms and names, indescribable, unthinkable and absolutely changeless. Nevertheless, He is endowed with creative power of Lakṣmi-śakti which is of the nature of movement. *Avyakta Kāla* and *Puruṣa* are the static manifestations of this power; but in its dynamic aspect, it is of the nature of will and thought resulting in action. *Avyakta* refers to the unevolved state of the three *guṇas*, which afterwards, evolve gradually from this unmanifest state. The equilibriated portion of these three *guṇas* stand for the *Prakṛti* of the *Sāṃkhya*-system, whereas *Puruṣa* stands for a collection of individual selves.

Prakṛti is, no doubt, the dynamic principle that undergoes transformation for the production of the universe. *Puruṣa*, on the contrary, is the unchangeable conscious principle involved in creation. Time is the factor that brings together *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*, and, thereby, acts as the joining principle in the process of creation. Although *Puruṣa*, *Kāla* and *Prakṛti* are the three categories, operative in creation, yet in themselves, they are not capable of evolving the world. They are moved to action by *Viṣṇu-samkalpa* or the thought-activity of God, which, therefore, is the real non-mechanical force, operative in this process of world-formation.

The *Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā*, further, describes in details, the evolution of different categories of the psycho-physical type. It particularly shows that the *jīvas* and the *manus*, though pure in themselves, become dislodged from the pure state by the influence of *avidyā*. Then, by becoming associated with the psycho-physical elements through the will of God, they suffer misery and undergo transmigration. When the *jīvas* are emancipated, they enter into the supreme power of God which is their Highest Destination. That the Highest reality is Lord *Viṣṇu*, who, though, unaffected in Himself, yet by His own power creates everything of this world, seems to be the common tenet of the *Vaiṣṇava-Sāṃkhya*. All matter and objects are the manifestations of His own Power and it is He who moves His power in the forms of *Puruṣa*, *Prakṛti* and *Kāla* to create this universe. God is the source of all things and beings. He is calm, full of happiness for all time, devoid of fear and grief and completely dissociated from attachment to worldly objects. Those,

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

who single-mindedly meditate on the true nature of God, can certainly understand the *māyā* of the Lord, and can also become free from the manifold influences of this worldly-life. The cosmology, accepted in the *Vaiṣṇava*-philosophy, is also in essential parts similar to the cosmology accepted by the *Sāṃkhya* school.

A faint throbbing of this theistic vein of the *Kapila-Sāṃkhya* is audible, even to day, in the classical *Yoga*-philosophy, although the doctrine of theism, here, is very loosely connected with the fundamental position of *Yoga*-physics. *Iśvara* is not necessary for the creation and dissolution of the psycho-physical universe. He is not even absolutely necessary for the attainment of liberation. But if any body fixes his mind on God, then in that case, God, being pleased, removes the obstacles in the path of His devotees, and it, therefore, becomes easier for him to attain liberation. Physics of the *Yoga* school being identical with the *Sāṃkhya*-physics, there is no need for the postulation of God as the creative principle of the world.

Atheistic and Semi-dualistic Stage, represented by Pañcaśikha's Teachings and the Caraka-Samhitā:

Pañcaśikha, the well-known Sāṃkhya teacher, seems to have interpreted the theistic *Sāṃkhya* of the sage *Kapila* in an atheistic manner. This was, perhaps, due to the fact that during the period of *Pañcaśikha*, the *buddhistic* thought was very much in prominence. To allow free thinking and rational consideration of each problem, was the characteristic of the *buddhistic* school; and *Pañcaśikha*, therefore, might have tried to revise the original theistic *Sāṃkhya* in a more rational way with a view to make it more logical. To do so, he was naturally forced to remain silent on the problem of God, since His existence could not be proved by pure reasoning. There was no place left for *Iśvara* in his *Sāṃkhya*, and he was bold enough to carry his conclusions rationally to their logical ends, thereby completely changing the metaphysical position of the original *Sāṃkhya*.

According to *Pañcaśikha*, the highest reality is not the *Puruṣottama* or God, but a unified category of *Avyakta* and *Puruṣa*.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

(*Puruṣa-vastham avyaktam*) Consciousness is not the essence of the self, or *purusa*, but it springs forth in the self, if it gets associated with the body. The collective whole of mind, body and 'cetas' is the *Kṣetra*, and the soul that resides in the *Kṣetra* is known as the *Kṣetrajña*. The existence of the permanent self is to be postulated, as otherwise, we shall not be able to explain our sense of responsibility and moral duties. The self can transcend the state of *avyakta* and can gain its pure form, which is a state of characterless existence. Since consciousness arises from the conglomeration of elements and is destroyed with its destruction, the ultimate state is absolutely indeterminate. For that reason *Pañcaśikha* says that there is neither ultimate destruction, nor eternal existence of any entity of determinate character (*uccheda niṣṭhā nehāsti, bhāvaniṣṭha na vartate*). The state of release is described as being identical with that when all rivers completely lose themselves in the ocean. The worldly life is colourful and luxurious, but all colours fall off when the self becomes emancipated. When endowed with consciousness, the self experiences the three-fold feeling of pleasure, pain and indifference. The five elements, in a state of union, produce the sense-knowledge and other kinds of knowledge, and this conglomeration is what is called the mind-body system. The cause of sorrow is to regard this system of diverse elements and qualities as the self. It is by such false knowledge that there is endless sufferings and pains. Since this conglomeration is not the self, every attachment to it as 'I' and 'mine' is false. Salvation consists in the ultimate renunciation of all these phenomena. The three *guṇas* mentioned in this philosophy stand for different psychical states only. The elements become conglomerated by nature, and their disintegration also takes place, without the intervention of any God or *Iśvara*. Although *Pañcaśikha* banished God from his account of *Sāṃkhya*, he could not make *avyakta* and *Puruṣa* independent and equally supreme. The average Indian mind was more accustomed to believe in the supremacy of some spiritual being. Anything, not in tune with this belief, would not be acceptable to them. Hence, *Pañcaśikha* too described *avyakta* to be in the womb of *Puruṣa*(1), which therefore was supposed to be the superior principle.

1. The Mahābhārata—218, 12 (Chap. XII)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

This atheistic line was more fully developed in the *Sāṃkhya* of the *Caraka Samhitā*, which, too, has accepted, as ultimate, a unified category of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. In the chapter on the *Caraka-Samhitā*, we have already discussed why the word *avyaktam* is to be understood to stand for both *puruṣa* and the *avyakta prakṛti*. Prof. S.N. Das Gupta has stated that this *avyaktam*, of the *Caraka-Samhitā* is similar to the *Puruṣavastham avyaktam* of *Pañcaśikha's* philosophy.(1) In all other details also, the *Sāṃkhya* account of the *Caraka Samhitā* displays the same features as are found in the philosophy of *Pañcaśikha*.

According to the *Caraka Samhitā*, the collective whole of the five *mahābhūtas*, the ten senses, five subtle elements, *manas*, *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *avyakta*, is truly the man or the *rāśipurusa*. All *Karma*, knowledge, pleasure, pain, ignorance, etc. belong to this conglomeration. Man enjoys all these phenomenal happenings only in this life. But there is also the abiding self, residing in the conglomeration, as otherwise, the enjoyment of the fruits of action, bondage and liberation, etc. will be of no meaning to us. The self, in its abiding and pure form, is called the *paramātman* and it is uncaused and beginningless. Consciousness, however, does not constitute the essence of the self. All conscious states arise in the *ātman* only when it joins the conglomeration of psycho-physical elements. The soul, therefore, becomes a knower, only when it is associated with the organs of cognition. The pure self is called the *Kṣetrajña* when it enters into the *Kṣetra* (the aggregate of elements, composing the psycho-physical complex). The relation between the *Kṣetrajña* and the *Kṣetra* is *anādi* (beginningless). Increase in *raja* and *ātma guṇas* strengthens this bond, but if the *sattva-guṇa* is increased, then the bond between the two breaks down and the *ātman* regains the pure form.

The pure self is immortal, one and all pervading, and it contains all the empirical selves, which function through the senses and the mind. All sorts of experience belong to the empirical self or the *rāśi-puruṣa*, and not to the pure transcendental *ātman*. (*Rāśi Puruṣas* are many in number, but the transcendental self or pure *puruṣa* is one). The self in its pure form, is detached from the senses

1. History of Indian Philosophy Vol. I.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

and mind and is eternal and unchangeable; but in its empirical form, it is associated with the *manas* and the senses and is in the sphere of knowledge and change.

The state of emancipation is a state of colourless existence. In this state the soul is liberated from its phenomenal shell and goes beyond the sphere of *prakṛti* or *Nature*. The soul, in this state, attains *Brahma-hood* and is no more manifested in the life of *Samsāra*. When *rajas* and *tamas* remain in a subdued condition and the fruits of action are totally exhausted there is this complete transcendence of the body by the self, and a final annihilation of experience. Production of different categories, with the exception of the *tanmātras* is also mentioned in this *Samhitā*. At the time of dissolution, all the evolutes return back to *Avyakta*, whereas at the time of new creation, they are again evolved from their great source. There is no place for God or *Īśvara* in this doctrine. This account of *Caraka* is clearly atheistic, but its dualistic trait remains concealed in the *Avyakta-shell*. Here, spirit and matter are not declared separate and independent, like the *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* of the orthodox school.

Prof. S.N. Das Gupta has attached great importance to the *Sāṃkhya* teachings of *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka*. In his opinion, "from the point of view of history of Philosophy, the Sāṃkhya of *Caraka* and *Pañcaśikha* is very important; for it shows a transitional stage of thought between the *upaniṣad* ideas and the orthodox *Sāṃkhya* doctrine as represented by *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*.(1) The theistic and monistic *Sāṃkhya* that started in the *Upaniṣads*, passed, thus, to the atheistic and dualistic *Sāṃkhya* of the classical school, through the mediation of the *Sāṃkhya*-philosophy of *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka*.

Atheistic and Dualistic Stage represented by Arāda, Īśvarakṛṣṇa and also the author of the Samkhya-Sutras:

Arāda distinguishes between *Prakṛti* and *Vikṛti* and holds that the former group consists of five elements *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *avyakta*. By *vikrtis*, however, he refers to the objects of senses, the hands and feet, the voice, the organs of generation, excretion and mind. All these *Prakṛti* and *Vikṛtis* constitute the *kṣetra*, and the

1. History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. I p. 219.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

self that resides in the *Kṣetra*, is known as the *Kṣetrajña*. Thus, *Kṣetrajña*' and 'eightfold *Prakṛti*' are described, here, as distinct and different, and no mention of one's subordination to the other is found in this book. The *kṣetrajña* refers to the individual soul and thus constitutes the 25th principle, besides eightfold *Prakṛti* and *Vikāras*. God is not mentioned by *Arāda*. The causes of the cycle of existence are to be sought in ignorance, action and desire. If an individual soul can make itself free from this three-fold cause, it will attain liberation which is a characterless and unchangeable existence. By assuming the form of *kṣetrajña*, the soul identifies itself with action, forms, and desires, and passes through all sorts of worldly relations and attachments. When this shackle of empirical life is shattered completely, the knower gently flows into the state of release and goes beyond all experience. The three *guṇas*, however, are not mentioned by *Arāda* and this is, no doubt, an important omission.

The appearance of the *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* removes the period of conjecture and hypothesis, as it lays down a clear and definite exposition of the *Sāṃkhya*-doctrine. There is, however, a difference of opinion regarding the date of *Iśvarakṛṣṇa*. Garbe holds that the date of *Isvarakrsna* was 100 A.D. but Mr. Keith places him in the fourth century A.D. Dr. Belvalkar, on the other hand, places him in the 1st century A.D. or the 1st half of the second century. According to Prof. S.N. Das Gupta, the date of *Kārikā* was about 200 A.D. But since *Caraka* (78 A.D.) does not refer to the *Sāṃkhya* as described by *Iśvarakṛṣṇa*, we may suppose that his date could not be earlier than 78 A.D.

The fundamental doctrine of the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* is the dualism between *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. These two are supposed to be entirely distinct and wholly independent of each other; and no attempt is made to derive them from a higher principle. This dualistic tendency may be regarded as a natural disintegration of the monistic thought of the *Upaniṣads*; and the banishment of this higher principle of synthesis becomes perceptible, for the first time, in the *Sāṃkhya* teachings of *Pañcaśikha*, during the period of the epic philosophy. The upanisadic division of the soul into *Parmātman* and *Jīvātman* and the consequent attachment of great importance to

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Jīvātman as the upholder of experience, lessens the importance of the Supreme Spirit. Hence, a more rational approach to Philosophy, in the age of *Pañcaśikha*, has made God perfectly unnecessary and superfluous. *Īśvarakṛṣṇa* has adopted this atheistic attitude, since he too, has keenly felt the absence of any rational justification for our belief in God. The extreme disinterestedness of the spiritual principle and the recognition of *Prakṛti*, (constituted of the three *guṇas*) as the independent cause of all inner and outer modifications of the world, are the important characteristics of the classical *Sāṃkhya*. In the original theistic *Sāṃkhya*, the dualism between an inactive indifferent spirit and an active dynamic *Prakṛti* is recognized, but both of them are supposed to form dual aspects of a "tertium quid" serving as the common substratum of the whole show. Non-recognition of this ultimate unity is an important feature of the atheistic *Sāṃkhya* of *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka*, and as such it is also very prominent in the *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* of *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*. The *Sāṃkhya-Sutra* also presents series of arguments to prove its non-theistic character.

The most important topic of the *Sāṃkhya* system is its doctrine of the three *guṇas* which are supposed to be the real creative forces of this universe. In the '*avyakta*-state', they lie in equilibrium; but as soon as they start moving, due to the transcendental influence of *puruṣa*, they evolve *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and the rest. It is their relative proportion in things that cause differences of character and function in the world. The reference of the three *guṇas* is found in the *Upaniṣads* (Chapter on the *Upaniṣads*) and hence their existence can be traced back to the age of the upaniṣadic philosophy. To mention the three *gunas* seems to be customary in the post-upaniṣadic *Sāṃkhya* and the doctrine was probably derived from the three mental states of pleasure, pain and indifference of individual mind. The tendency to derive three *guṇas* from the psychical states persisted till the advent of the classical *Sāṃkhya*. Even in the *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā*, the nature of these three is not clearly exposed. Even Vācaspati and *Gauḍapāda*, the two well-known commentators of the *Sāṃkhya-Kārika*, have not given any clear description of the nature of these three *guṇas*. It is only in the writings of *Vijñāna-bhikṣu*, that we find the *guṇas* being described as real elements of super-subtle substances, composing *Prakṛti* or *Pradhāna*.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The idea of the gradual development of the world from the womb of some unconscious, unmanifest principle is also present in the philosophy of the *Upaniṣads.*(1) So the contention, that the *Sāṃkhya* doctrine of the origin and development of the world from nature is derived from the *Upaniṣads*,—is grounded on reason. From the time of the *Upaniṣads* upto the period of the classical *Sāṃkhya*, some sort of cosmology is given in each account of the *Sāṃkhya*. This suggests that the upholders of this school of thought have always felt very keenly the need for giving some explanation of the external world in which man lives and moves. The *Sāṃkhya* categories, in one form or another, are present in the different systems of the pre-*Kārikā* stage; their order of development, however, is not everywhere the same. The *tanmātras* are omitted in many accounts (the epic, the *Gītā*, the *Caraka Samhitā*, etc.) and in their places, some sort of subtle *bhūtas* (elements) are substituted. According to *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā*, Mahat comes from Nature, from the *Mahat*, *ahaṃkāra* is evolved, on which depend the mind and the ten organs of knowledge and action, as well as the five tanmātras. From the five *tanmātras* arise the five *mahābhūtas*. These with *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* constitute the 25 categories of the *Sāṃkhya* school. Here *Prakṛti* is as real as the *ātman* or *Puruṣa* and so the world, that is grounded on Nature, is real and objective in the true sense. *Prakṛti* catches the reflection of *Puruṣa*, and as a result of such reflection, there is an illusory union between the two realities, and a conseqeuent emergence of life and experience from the ceaseless combination of the *guṇa*—reals. (This idea of reflection is present in the *Kapila-Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa.*) The sufferings of existence are dependent on this seeming union, the removal of which is, therefore, absolutely necessary for the attainment of liberation. The real object of disturbance in the state of *Prakṛti* and creation of the universe is twofold. Nature engages herself in creative acts to become the object of enjoyment of *Puruṣa*, and also to liberate the soul from the torments and tortures that trouble life and hamper spiritual progress. The spirit is ever free, and all sorts of changes happen to *Prakṛti* alone; it is only the body that grows old and dies. The spirit does not suffer any change or transformation. But through ignorance, an apparent connection is established between *Puruṣa* and *buddhi*,

1. Muṇḍaka—1-8.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

as a result of which sorrows and sufferings, pain, and misery, which really belong to *buddhi*, seem to follow *Puruṣa* from birth to birth. It is necessary, therefore, that through discriminatory knowledge, we should form in *Buddhi*, the true conception of the nature of *puruṣa*. Then, with the help of this saving knowledge, we shall be able to attain liberation permanently from this sorrowful existence. The process of deliverance is to be conceived as individual. So, with the attainment of relesae by one soul, *Prakṛti* does not cease to function. There are other *puruṣas* to be liberated. Hence, Nature, in order to bring about in the other *puruṣas*, the recognition of their distinctness, and therewith, their emancipation, unfolds itself ceaselessly and the world, consequently, persists. The state of emancipation can be brought about by discriminatory knowledge. The attainment of such knowledge should, therefore, be regarded as the 'summun bonum' of human life. This state of release, however, is not a state of bliss as described by the *advaitins*. It is simply a state of pure consciousness in which there is the complete destruction of the three-fold misery of human-life. The soul, having passed beyond the bondage of the *guṇas*, shines forth in its own lustre (pure consciounsess). The state of emancipation is, thus, a state of non-ending purity, devoid of all feeling element. This idea, that the sufferings disappear on knowledge of the true nature of 'ātman',—is present in the *upaniṣads*. Both the *Vedānta* and the classical *Sāṃkhya* have formulated their maxim that "Deliverance is gained by knowledge", on the basis of the upaniṣadic teachings. But while the *vedānta* has accepted the upaniṣadic view of the soul as joy and bliss, the classical Sāṃkhya has laid down its full stress on the conscious nature of the soul, since in the opinion of this school, all happiness and pain belong to Nature. Though connected directly with the teachings of *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka*, it has not accepted their theory of characterless *Mokṣa* (liberation). This is perhaps due to the fact that the conception of the soul in the classical *Sāṃkhya* is different from that of *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka*. Both *Pañcaśikha* and *Caraka* described the soul as having no specific nature or character, (perhaps due to the pressing influence of the buddhistic *anātma-vada*) whereas in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* the soul is supposed to be pure consciousness or intelligence which shines forth in its own light. In this respect, the classical *Sāṃkhya* is more truth-

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

ful to the philosophical teachings of the *upaniṣads*. The pessimism, with which the classical *Sāṃkhya* starts, and which is more or less present in all forms of *Sāṃkhya* can be traced back to the *Upaniṣads*. The under-lying view of the *upaniṣads* is that the self alone is *ānanda* and that all else is perishable and, therefore, filled with sorrow.(1) The complete destruction of sorrow and also the full realisation of the true nature of *Ātman*, therefore, form the main purpose of human life. The pre-*Kārikā Sāṃkhyas* too proclaim that sufferings can be stopped by transcending the bonds of the three *guṇas*; and such transcendence alone constitutes the *Puruṣārtha* of human beings. The manifold influences of these pre-*Kārikā* tendencies on the final shape of the classical *Sāṃkhya* cannot be definitely and precisely ascertained for lack of historical evidence. But the three lines of development, already suggested, may be accepted as the possible and conceivable stages in the evolution of this school of thought. There were some other schools of *Sāṃkhya* in existence, according to the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, but a detailed study of these is not possible for lack of information.

The *Kārikā* is a complete work by itself, and presents a regular system of thought. The dualistic realism of this philosophy has received the attention of many commentators within and beyond the *Sāṃkhya-fold*. They have tried to interpret the system from their own points of view; and hence many new centres of interest have been created by them. *Vijñāna-bhikṣu* (being theistic) has tried hard to prove that the *Sāṃkhya*-doctrine is not atheistic but theistic. In support of this theory, he has quoted profusely, in his *Vijñānamṛta bhāṣya* the passages of the *purāṇas*, where both the principles (*Puruṣa and Prakṛti*) are said to become merged in the end in *Īśvara*, who is the real controller of the processes of evolution and dissolution. But the distinct atheistic tone of the *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* cannot be ignored. It does explain all facts without the intervention of *Īśvara* and thus banishes for ever, from its own fold, the idea of a creator God. The *Sāṃkhya-sūtra* which seems to be composed after the 9th cen-

1. Bṛhad. Upaniṣad.
   3-9-28-7.
   3-4-2.
   3-5-1.
   3-7-23.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

tury, also teaches dualism and atheism; and while the *Kārikā* observes silence over the problem of God, the *Sāṃkhya-sūtra* definitely attempts at the refutation of *Isvara*. The dual principles of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* and their apparent connection are all that is necessary for the explanation of creation and dissolution; and these, with the immutable law of *Karma*, *Dharma* and *Adharma* will also account for the transmigration of souls, from which one is not freed until he acquires the knowledge of discrimination. Of course, there are serious difficulties in this conception of rigid dualism in the absence of a higher principle of synthesis; (for instance, the initial disturbance of the equilibrium, the possibility of orderly evolution from unconscious *prakṛti*, the purpose of the evolution, etc. are some of the knotty problems of the dualistic *Sāṃkhya*) but that must not be the ground for seeking to insert 'tretium quid' in the classical *Sāṃkhya*, when actually no such category exists in that doctrine.

: B :

Summing up with a Special Reference to the transition of the Sāṃkhya School of Thought from the Idealistic to the Realistic position:

After going through all the possible sources which contain the elements of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy, and also of its development through different stages, it may be well to try to sum up the whole in the end.

On ground of evidences collected so far, it may not be unjustifiable to assert that the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy of the Sage *Kapila* is wholly theistic. It admits the existence of one Spiritual Being who is fully responsive to devotion and prayer, offered by His devotee with a pure and unpolluted mind. He is the all-pervading Principle, the seer of all experiences and the eternal support of all things and beings of the universe. In this superior Lord, the universe is woven like warp and woof in a piece of cloth. He alone is the ruler and administrator of the world. Under His guidance, this phenomenal show is happening continuously without any gap or break. Though He is the real Controller and deliverer of good and evil to men all these activities are performed by Him through His *Kriyā-śākti* which is known as *Māyā* or *Prakṛti*.

The Supreme Lord is, no doubt, the existent eye in each human eart, but the living creatures cannot conceive Him by means of

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

their sense, minds and words. He is the Lord of all, he is the Lord of Himself, and He is the Lord of *Mayā*,—the cause of this phenomenal existence. So, *Prakṛti* is not an independent entity. It is the power of the Supreme *Puruṣa* and is, therefore, inseparable from its Lord. This Supreme soul or God is devoid of the influence of the three *guṇas*, which remain submerged in *Prakṛti*; and as such the soul is never affected by the impurities of mind and body which are the products of the *guṇa-mayee Māyā*. Empirical selves, being the replicas of the Supreme soul, are in essence as pure and unpolluted as their great source. But due to the influence of ignorance or *avidyā* the embodied souls identify themselves with the mind-body systems and become overwhelmed with griefs and joys of life. The wise men whose understanding is not clouded by the influence of *Māyā*, fully realise the secret of life and its false allurements. By pinning their faith in the Supreme Lord, they can make themselves free from the painful vortex of empirical existence.

The *Upaniṣads* too have spoken very often in favour of theism. The *Brahman* consequently is declared as the controlling Lord and the ordering principle of the whole universe. Acknowledgement of *Māyā* as the creative power of this Supreme Lord is also found in the *Upaniṣads*. The theistic *Sāṃkhya* of the early stage follows this *Upaniṣadic* tradition and proclaims through its ideas and concepts, the glory and power of one Supreme *Puruṣa* (God). This early stage represents to us a period when the *Sāṃkhya* and the *vedānta* views of the world were not altogether incompatible. Both spoke in favour of one ultimate Reality. The matrix of the world too was not regarded as independent and absolute.

The main trend of the *Sāṃkhya* thought in the epic (excepting the atheistic teachings of *Pañcaśikha*) is also mono-theistic. The dualism between the individual *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* is of course recognized, but this dualism is ultimately transcended in the epic, since both the principles are regarded as aspects of one Supreme Being who is beyond the sphere of the *guṇas*. In the *Bhagavadgītā* also, we do not find atheism among the *Sāṃkhyas*. Both *Parā Prakṛti* and *Aparā Prakrti* belong to God who alone is supremely real. Although there is apparent duality between spirit and matter, ultimately both are absorbed in God, and the whole atmosphere is,

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

thus, permeated with the spirit of monotheism. The universe exists in Him and is also an expression of His glory and grandeur. By His own creative nature and will, He has been ever creating, preserving and destroying this universe; yet, He himself is unaffected by any of these changes. He is the essence of all things, the life-force of all beings, and also the final resting place of the whole universe.

This theistic atmosphere of the *Sāṃkhya* seems to change its colour with the introduction of *Pañcaśikha's* philosophy. During this period, the buddhistic philosophy seems to have gained a prominent place in the History of Indian thought.(1) The rational and more logical approach of Lord *Buddha* to fundamental problems dealt a mortal blow to all sorts of dogmatic philosophical ideas and irrational speculations of the time. The buddhistic thinkers had carried their logical analysis far enough to drive out the ideas of God and Permanent Soul from the pale of their philosophy. In their opinion, all production and destruction are due to the necessary integration and disintegration of conditions. Consciousness is not an eternal permanent principle. It is also caused and temporary, like the other temporary objects of the world. The existence of God as the supremely conscious being is also illogical. *Pañcaśikha* has developed this atheistic attitude of the buddhistic school in his philosophy, and has also accepted that all is due to conglomeration of conditions, but he has not been able to rise above the traditional faith in a permanent soul. He has admitted the existence of an abiding soul in his philosophy. Of course, he has not described the self as pure consciousness and bliss. Consciousness, he thinks, is an emergent quality which is generated in the soul, as a result of association with the body. By admitting the reality of a permanent self, *Pañcaśikha*, perhaps, has tried to make his philosophy more popular than the buddhistic system, which has brought revolutionary changes in the traditional atmosphere of Indian philosophy and culture. *Caraka* too has formulated an atheistic *Sāṃkhya*, akin to that of *Pañcaśikha*. In the classical period, (which is a period more of logic than of faith) this atheistic attitude has found a very

1. Pañcaśikha criticized the view of those who admitted avidyā, karma and tṛṣṇā as the causes of bondage. (Śānti Parva 218).
This refers to the doctrine of the Saugata School.
(Nilkaṇṭha's commentary)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

powerful echo in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* of *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*. The classical *Sāṃkhya* does not approve of the existence of God on the ground that there are no logical proofs to establish His reality. In this respect, the classical *Sāṃkhya* does not differ very much from the *Kantian* philosophy of the Western world, since Kant too, has rejected all logical proofs of the existence of God as unsatisfactory. (He has, however, based his belief in God on ethical grounds and this attempt is wantng in the orthodox *Sāṃkhya*).

The distinction between the theistic and the atheistic *Sāṃkhya* leads further to a distinction between the idealistic and the realistic approach of the system to the riddles of life and the universe. The distinction between idealism and realism lies in this, that while the former believes that the object is dependent on some mind (finite or infinite) in respect of both its knowledge and being, the latter says that the object is dependent upon the mind only in so far as it is known; otherwise, it is independent of mind or consciousness.

On ground of this distinction, we can say that the theistic *Sāṃkhya* is inclined more towards idealism than towards realism. Of course, like the *Vedānta* the theistic *Sāṃkhya* does not say that the object is an illusory appearance of the subject. It has a basis other than the Eternal Subject of all knowledge; yet this basis is nothng but the creative power or the *Prakṛti-Śakti* of God and is inseparable from Him. Being the power of God it is not fundamentally different from Him. In fact, it is conceived as the thought and will power of God in the *Vaiṣṇava Sāṃkhya*. Both the subjective and the objective principles of phenomenal experience are rooted in God. It is He, who by moving His own power, projects this colourful universe out of His own Being. He is the subject, He is the object, He is matter, He is spirit, He is the enjoyer and the enjoyed; everything rests on him. Hence, though the world of objects is independent of the individual *puruṣa*, it is not independent of the Supreme Soul. The *Yoga-vasiṣṭha* (an important work on Indian idealism) also holds that the subjective and the objective aspects of our experience are nothing but the expressions of one all-inclusive Absolute which is the ultimate ground of this Universe.(1) The idealistic element is very prominent in the *Kapila*

1. The Yogāvasiṣṭha and its Philosophy by B.L. Atreya, M.A. D. Litt.—page 246-247.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Sāṃkhya of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, where the finite selves are described as so many reflections of one Infinite *Puruṣa*. The Universal self, by reflecting itself in *Māyā*, assumes the innumerable forms of limited selves whose limitation consists in ignorance of their true nature and consequent deprivation of knowledge. If this *Kapila* is regarded as the founder of the Sāṃkhya school, then it can be asserted with due justification, that the original *Sāṃkhya* was not only theistic but it was also idealistic in its outlook, having a great affinity with the vedānta-thought.

The element of realism becomes more and more prominent as the *Sāṃkhya* apporaches more and more to atheistic form. In the *Sāṃkhya* view of *Caraka* and *Pañcaśikha*, the soul is only an unconscious principle, and knowledge belongs to the phenomenal conglomeration. The soul is there to account for memory, recognition and the sense of moral responsibility. Towards production of objects, it contributes nothing. The body and all other objects result from the conglomeration of elements, without any assistance from the soul. The elements are associated and dissociated by Nature, without the co-operation of any other conscious agent.

(*Te svabhāvena tiṣṭhanti viyujyante svabhāvataḥ*)

Again, it is the pure soul that appears as so many empirical selves by entering into so many mind-body systems; and so the empirical selves are not illusory in the *Vedānta*-sense of the term.

Realism is all the more prominent in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* where *Prakṛti* is so much perfected that it can explain the whole universe, even without receiving any influence from the *Puruṣa*. *Prakṛti* alone can carry the processes of evolution and dissolution, as creativity seems to be in its very nature and being. It is only when the search for plan and purpose in the evolutionary process of the unconscious nature is undertaken, that we feel the need for postulating some spiritual principle which will give meaning to life and its experience. *Prakṛti*, here, is supposed to be absolutely independent of *Puruṣa*, and the w rld, therefore, is not metaphysically soul-dependent. For preserving the realistic tendency in full strength, the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* has further advocated the existence of plurality of transcendental souls (lest only one transcendental self makes the individual *puruṣas*

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

unreal and illusory). Each *puruṣa* becomes associated with buddh through reflection, and on account of this, it falsely identifies itself with the intellect through ignorance and somehow owns the pleasures and pains. The knower is real, the known also is metaphysically real; only their relatedness in the epistemological sphere is false. Hence, we find that this transition from theism to atheism also records greater and greater predominance of realism than idealism in the process of the evolution of the *Sāṃkhya* school of thought.

A Clarification:

Interpretation of the guṇas:

On page 22, paragraphs 1 and 2, I have stated: "This interpretation of the gunas as subtle substances or reals has, first of all, been given to us by Bhiksu in his *Samkhya-Pravacana-bhasya*; Vācaspati Miśra and Gaurapada did not provide us with any explanation of the nature of the gunas from this point of view."

It is true that the nature of the three gunas as super-sensible substance was definitely and elaborately discussed by Vijnana Bhiksu in his *Samkhya Pravacana Bhasya*. But in the *Sree Bhasya*, we come across passages where Ramanuja has criticised the followers of *Samkhya* for holding the view that the three gunas are super-sensible substances. In Anniruddha's Commentary also *Tadatmya* between Prakrti and three *gunas* has been mentioned.

The Authoress

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

APPENDIX

Some Important Sāṃkhya Concepts and Terms Clarified:

Avyakta:

In the *Upaniṣads*, the matrix of the world is described as *Avyaktam*; and this term literally means that which is unmanifest. The *Katha Upaniṣad* says: "The Objects are beyond the senses, the mind beyond the objects, the intellect beyond the mind, the great soul beyond the intellect. The undeveloped is beyond the great soul and *puruṣa* is beyond the undeveloped principle.(1) The recognition of the first objective principle as an indeterminate homogeneous entity is also present in the *Taitt. Upaniṣad.*(2) which has described it as 'asat'. This indeterminate principle, from which the world has originated, is also described, in the *Upaniṣads*, as material. (3) The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* describes it as unborn, eternal and consisting of three *guṇas*.(4) This principle, however, is never conceived as separate and independent of *Brahman*. The unmanifest is the source, from which objects, sense-organs, mind, intellect, etc. have evolved in their proper order.

In the *Kapila Sāṃkhya* (as sketched in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*), this avyakta and *guṇamayee* nature of *Parkṛti* is made prominent, and it has been described as that which in itself is unmanifest, but which is the stay of all manifestations. (This *Pradhāna* has three *guṇas* and as such is not *Brahman*). But *Prakṛti*, here, is viewed as the creative power of God and is not, therefore, independent. This view is, thus, in tune with the upaniṣadic idea of Nature or *Prakṛti*.

The *Mahābhārata*, too, has described *Prakṛti*, on many occasions, as *avyaktam* or unmanifest. It is also spoken of as the root cause

---

1. Katha Upanisad-3-11.
2. Taitt. Upanisad 2-7.
3. Mundaka Upanisad—1. 1. 8.
4. Sveta. Upanisad 4-5.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

of the universe. For reference, we can quote extracts from different chapters of the *Śānti-Parvan.*

"*Avyaktamāhuḥ prakṛtim parām prakṛtivādinaḥ*"
(*Śānti*—306-27)

"*Sargapralya dharmattvādavyaktam trāhurakṣaram*".
(*Śānti*—307-13)

"*Tataslyajati so vyaktam sarga pralayadharmi vai,*
Nirguṇaḥ prakṛtim veda guṇayuktam acetanam".
(*Śānti*—307-11-12)

This *avyakta* is also regarded as the mother of the 23 categories. (1) The recognition of eight-fold *Prakṛti* is also found in the *Mahābhārata.* Five subtle *bhūtas, buddhi, avyaktam* and *ahaṃkāra* are the eight-fold *Prakṛti,* mentioned in this epic philosophy.(2)

This idea of eight-fold *Prakṛti* frequently occurs in the pre-*Kārikā Sāṃkhya,* and when we come to the *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* we find that out of these eight, only *avyaktam* is regarded as *Prakṛti* or the great unmanifest cause of this world. The epic also speaks of *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* as the three *guṇas* of Nature. *Prakṛti,* though independent of the individual *puruṣa,* is not independent of the highest reality.

The *Gītā* uses the word *Avayakta* in different senses. When used in the masculine gender, the word *avyakta* refers, usually, to *ātman* which is impericaptible by the ordinary sense-organs of a human being.(3) The word *avyakta* is also used in the *Gītā* in the sense of disappearance. In the second chapter of this sacred book, it has been stated that the beginning of the world is unknowable and the end, too, is not known by us. It is only in the middle that all beings become known and make their appearance on the stage of life. The word *avyakta* in the neuter gender, generally refers to the principle, from which the world is produced. The word *Prakṛti* is used, here, in the sense of the underlying principle of the world and is, therefore, synonymous with *avyaktam.*

1. Mahābhārata—306, 27-30 (Śānti Parvan)
2. Śānti Parvan 310-11-12.
3. The Gītā, Chap. 2-25.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Eight divisions of *Prakṛti* are also mentioned in the *Gītā*, but the unmanifest, here, does not form a part of these eight divisions.(1) *Prakṛti* refers to the lower nature of God, which with the help of his Higher nature creates this manifold universe. It is not, therefore, independent of God. The three *guṇas* are also mentioned. They are supposed to represent the three different psychical states of an individual soul. These *guṇas* do not constitute the nature of *Prakṛti*, but they evolve from *Prakṛti* and are present in all things and beings of the world.

The *Purāṇas*, also, use the word *avyakta* in the sense of a form of God and regard it as the unevolved cause of the whole world.

The *Caraka-Samhitā*, however, uses the word *avyaktam* in a peculiar sense. By this word, the author of this literature seems to mean a unified category of *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*.(2) This unified category is the only ultimate reality; and as such, it creates this colourful life of *samsāra*, and also nurses in its own bosom, the secret of emancipation or liberation from the cycle of births and deaths. (Increase of *Sattva-guṇa* helps a man to attain absolute freedom from all sorts of experience.)

In the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, the word *avyaktam* is used in the neuter gender and it is identified with *Prakṛti*. The word is used here in the sense of the undeveloped or the unmanifest. It is not apprehended by the senses, because it is subtle and super-sensuous. All the 23 categories of the world have gradually evolved from this great unmanifest. This *avyakta* consists of the three *guṇas* which are the real creative forces of the whole universe.

From the above scrutiny, it is clear that although the word *avyakta* has been used differently in different literatures, yet the *upaniṣadic* sense of the term, as referring to some undeveloped cause of the world is not much altered. The *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* follows the upaniṣadic tradition, and described the stuff of the world as undeveloped material, indeterminate and eternal, but it goes further to declare that this *avyakta* is wholly independent and ultimate.

1, The Gītā Chap. 7-4.

2. This point has been fully explained in the Chapter 'Sāṃkhya in Caraka'.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

This, in all probability, is due to the atheistic influence of *Pañcasikha, Caraka,* etc. on the philosophy of the *Sāṃkhya-Karika.*

Buddhi:

Buddhi or intellect as one of the categories is mentioned in the *Katha upaniṣad,*(1) but here, it is not described as the first evolved principle, as it is placed next to *Mahānātmā,* in the scheme of the evolutes. *Buddhi,* therefore, becomes an effect of the great cosmic soul. The functions of intellect are, ihowever, ascertainment and decision. Intellect, when enlightened with true knowledge, helps a man to attain the highest goal, after keeping, in proper subjugation, all his organs of sense-experience.

Kapila makes a distinction between *mahat* and *buddhi* (the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa,* 3-26). The *mahat* is, no doubt, the first evolute, and as such it contains within it the germs of the whole universe. But this *mahat* or the cosmic principle is not identical with the *buddhi.* The *buddhi* originates from *taijasa ahaṃkāra,* and it is simply a form of the *antaḥkaraṇa* that presides over the organs and sense-objects. Doubts, errors, memory and determinateness are the functions of this category, and it is not cosmic in nature and function.

The *Mahābhārata* has interpreted the term in different ways. Sometimes, it has been accepted as the first great evolute of *Prakṛti,* but in some other contexts, the intellect has been mentioned as an organ of the individual, just like mind and other sense-organs. In chapters 306, 310 and 210 of the *Śānti Parvan, mahat* or *buddhi* has been taken in the ordinary *Sāṃkhya* sense, and therefore, in these contexts, it stands for a cosmic principle. But in Chap. 307, *buddhi* is described simply as an organ, and it has been accepted as the cause of the organs of action. (*Karmendriyānām sarveṣām-vidyā buddhindriya smṛtam*). Again, in the *Bhagavadgītā,* the *buddhi* stands for intellect, but the relation of *buddhi* to *ahaṃkāra* is not clear. The *buddhi* is higher than the *manas,* and the self is higher than the *buddhi.*(2) Whether the principle of individuation is derived from the intellect or not, is not definitely stated in the *Gītā.*

1. Katha Upaniṣad 3. 10.
2. The Gītā Chap. 3-42.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

Some of the important *purāṇas* also admit *mahat* or *buddhi* as the first evolute, from which all other categories have arisen in due course.

In the *Caraka-Samhitā*, the *buddhi* is accepted as the first evolute of *avyakta*, and from it *ahaṃkāra* has come into existence. The self, here, is not conceived, as pure consciousness the reflection of which is caught by the intellect. On the other hand, the self enters into some sort of relation with the psycho-physical conglomeration, and due to this association, consciousness flares up in the embodied soul. Hence in the opinion of *Caraka*, the real *locus standi* of consciousness is the embodied soul; from this centre, the light is radiated in all parts of the body, including the internal organs. In this respect, this view differs from the view of the classical *Sāṃkhya*, where the buddhi becomes the repository of reflected consciousness. It is the meeting place of the light of *Puruṣa* from one side and the reflection of the external object from the other.

The *buddhi* or the *mahat* in the classical *Sāṃkhya* is, indeed, a phase in the cosmic growth and it is accepted in the cosmic sense. In its psychological aspect, it is known as *buddhi*, but in its cosmic aspect, it is called *mahat*. This *mahat* or *buddhi-tattva* is not individual or particular. It includes within it the individual *buddhis* of all *puruṣas* and is, therefore, universal in this sense. The potency of the physical world is also included in it. "Looked at from this point of view, it has the widest and most universal existence comprising all creation and is thus called *mahat* (the great one). It is called *linga* (sign), as the other later existences or evolutes give us the ground of inferring its existence, and as such must be distinguished from the *Prakṛti* which is called *alinga*, i.e. of which no linga or characteristic may be affirmed."(1) Senses and the mind function for the intellect, but the intellect functions directly for the good of the *purusa*.

Ahaṃkāra:

The word *ahamkara* appears in the *Praśna-upaniṣad* (4.8) and here, it seems to be used in the ordinary sense of ego-consciousness. The fine elements, the gross elements, the sense organs, the organs

1. Prof. S.N. Das Gupta : History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. I—249.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

of action and also the internal organs are mentioned; and all these make up an individual. *Ahaṃkāra* refers to the sense of individuation, present in the *jīva*. In the *Śvetāśvatara-upaniṣad*, the term *ahaṃkāra* is not expressly mentioned; but of the six sets of eight mentioned in the verse 1.4, one set refers to eight-fold Nature, consisting of the five elements, mind, intellect and egoism. Reference to this term is also available in the *Maitrāyani upaniṣad*, where the psychic body of the spirit is supposed to be composed of intellect and individuation.

In the *Kapila-Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, the category of *ahaṃkāra* is recognized as the second evolute; but here *mahat* is not identified with the *buddhi-tattva*. *Buddhi*, here, means the inner organ of an individual and it is spoken of as an evolute of *taijasa ahaṃkāra*. The ego arises first, and then becomes adorned with the organs of *buddhi*, *manas*, etc., which are the other evolutes. The creation of ego-ense is not the only function of *ahaṃkāra*. It also creates the objective world which arises from its *tāmasa* aspect or *bhūtadi*.

In the epic, *ahaṃkāra* has been differently interpreted in different contexts. In some places, it has been mentioned as an evolute from the *mahat* or the great cosmic principle.(1) But the effects of this *ahaṃkāra-tattva* are not usually the same as in the *Kārikā* of *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*. Sometimes, *ahaṃkāra* is regarded as the originator of *bhutamatra*, *manas* and *bhutas* or the elements are supposed to arise from the mind.(2) Of course, there are also the contexts in which *ahamkara* is spoken of as the source of the elements from which the world has sprung up with all its sights and sounds. In other words, *ahamkara* is regarded as the source of the objective world. But organs of sense as well as of action are supposed to arise from the eight-fold Nature and not solely from the principle of individuation. In this respect, therefore, there is difference between the epic version of this *Sāṃkhya* principle and its classical version.

The *Bhagavadgītā* mentions *ahaṃkāra* as a member of the eight-fold *Prakṛti*, constituting the lower nature of God. It is not men-

1. The Mahābhārata Chap. XII—306, 307.
2. The Mahābhārata: 18, 19-(310)

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

tioned as the source of *bhautika-elements*, which form the stuff of the physical world. There is no mention of *ahaṃkāra* as the source of the organs either. The relation of this principle with *buddhi* is not also definitely ascertained.

The *Purāṇas* speak of *ahaṃkāra* as an evolute of the *mahat*. It is theprinciple which bifurcates itself into two, viz., the specifically subjective and the objective. The individual ego as well as the objective world emerge from this principle.

In the *Caraka Samhitā*, *ahaṃkāra* is spoken of as a part of the eight-fold *Prakṛti*, which constitutes the stuff of the psycho-physical world. This principle is derived from *buddhi* and the source of the five elements and the senses. Here, *ahaṃkāra* seems to have been used as the basic principle of ego-hood and objectivity.

The *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* gives us a similar interpretation of *ahaṃkāra*. Here, it has been described as the principle, which develops on the one hand into definite sense of individuality and on the other into the elements of the objective world. The general *asmitā* sense on the psychical plane becomes more and more determinate and produces the individual ego-hood, from which develops individual organs of sense and action. The function of the ego is self-assertion. The individual egos and senses remain associated with invididual *buddhi* in order to bring into existence so many *jīvas* or living beings. So far as knowledge is subject to the influence of the sense and the ego, it is particular; but when knowledge refers to general intelligence (where there is a community of all *buddhis*), it assumes the universal character.

The Three Guṇas:

The three *guṇas* were first of all mentioned in the *Chānd Upaniṣad* (6-4) as the three elements of fire, water and earth which exist in all things. After that, these *guṇas* were described more definitely as the constituents of *Prakṛti* in the *Ajāśruti* of the *Śvetāśvatara upaniṣad*. The *guṇas*, here, are not only of all pervading nature, which in different proportions are present in all phenomena; but they are also the fetters that keep the free soul in bondage and pain. The names *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, however, do not occur

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

until the *Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad*. The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* proclaims that the *Absolute*, by becoming enshrouded by the *guṇas*, appears as the individual soul. Mr. Keith observes: 'It is not impossible that the subjective side of the *guṇas* (*sattvam*, *rajas* and *tamàs*) meaning thereby, *Sukha* (pleasure), *Duhkha* (pain) and *Moha* (indifference) which is clearly marked in these names, and which originally prevails in the classical *Sāṃkhya* was a development from the conception that the individual self was the result of the envelopment of the Absolute in the three *guṇas*, though originally referring to material products. Still, the tendency would be to see in them psychic states.'(1) Like the *Śvetasvatara Upaniṣad* the *Maitrāyani* also considers that the *Absolute* becomes enveloped by *guṇas*, but these *guṇas* belong to Nature. Being soiled by the *guṇas*, the *Brahman* appears as the individual self, and falls into error of vanity and egoism, through *avidyā* or ignorance. *Rajas* produces desires of various sorts and *tamas*, delusion and indifference. *Sattva*, however, produces knowledge and it, therefore, holds in itself the secret of emancipation.

The three *guṇas* are mentioned in the *Kapila Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavata Purāna*. Here, they refer to different psychical states, and are in Nature from the beginningless time. Devotion to God, which flows from the human-heart, naturally comes under the influence of the three *guṇas*. Consequently devotion is described as *sāttvika*, *rājasika* and *tāmasika*. Those who worship God in order to satisfy personal jealousy, pride or enmity are called *tāmasa*, those who become devoted to Him for the attainment of power, fame, etc. are called *rājasa*, and those who cling to Him for the washing away of all their demerits, are called *Sättvika*. The highest devotion is 'Nirguṇa-bhakti' which transcends all these 3 forms.

The *Mahābhārata* seems to have used the terms (*sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*) to stand for psychic states which make up the experience-stuff of human beings. They are eternally present in Nature. These three *guṇas* act like coverings in relation to *puruṣa*, and being enshrouded by them, the soul suffers misery and delusion. Living beings are also divided on the basis of these three *guṇas* into *sāttvika*, *rājasika* and *tāmasika*. The *sattvika jīvas* are born

1. A. B. Keith—the Sāṃkhya—System.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

in a higher world, the *rājasika jīvas* are born as men and those who have a predominant element of *tamas* are born as lower animals.

The *Gītā*-view of the *guṇas* differs from the preceding ones, in the sense, that here the three *guṇas* are described as the products of *Prakṛti*. (Chap. 14-5) It is the *guṇas* born of Nature that inspire men to act. The *guṇas* are the agents that bind the ever free soul to this life of *samsāra*, and being deluded by them, the self mistakenly thinks of itself as the doer and experiencer of the various sorts of pleasures and pains. The *guṇas*, however, stand for different psychical-states, a view that seems to be customarily held, since the time of the *upaniṣads*.

The mention of these three *guṇas*, as existing in *Prakṛti* and as referring to three types of mental qualities is also found in the *Puraṇas*. The *Manusmṛti* (Chap. 12. 24-52) gives us an elaborate description of these *guṇas*, which affect the life of a *jīva* in diverse ways. These three *guṇas* are supposed to be present in each and every being. *Sattva* gives rise to knowledge, *tamas* to ignorance and *rajas* creates aversion and attachment. All pious and venerable deeds owe their origin to the *sattva guṇa*, while the enjoyment of worldly pleasures etc. is due to the predominance of the element of *rajas*. *Tamas*, on the other hand, encourages greed, sluggishness, irreligious mood, etc.

In the *Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā*, *guṇas* are not regarded as equivalent to *Prakṛti*. *Guṇa* refers to the unevolved, undifferentiated state of pure potentiality which can best be described by the term *avyakta*. The unevolved *guṇa*, first of all, evolves itself into *sattva*, then from *sattva*, arises *rajas* and from *rajas*, again arises *tamas*. When the trinity is fully developed, some parts of the *guṇas* form an equilibrium which is known as *Prakṛti*. With the emergence of the three *guṇas*, the *manus* descend into them, and consequently come under the influence of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. *Tamas* is regarded as heavy, delusive and statical; *rajas* is always moving and palpitating and thereby creating sorrows of life; *sattva* is described as light, transparent, without impurities, and pleasurable.

In the *Caraka-Samhita* (78 A.D.), the pre-*Kārikā* description of the three *guṇas* as representing three types of psychical states is

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

adopted. All happiness and misery are due to the accumulation of *rajas* and *tamas* in the soul, but an increase in the *sattva-guṇa* unfastens the tie and releases the self from the entanglement of life. (*Śārīrasthānam*-34). This view of the *sattva-guṇa* was perhaps focussed through the classical *Sāṃkhya* when the latter declared that the secret of release remains hidden in the *sāttvika-buddhi*.

The most important topic in the classical *Sāṃkhya* is the doctrine of these three guṇas which form the very substance of *Prakṛti* or Nature. The classical *Sāṃkhya* attributes the evolution of the world wholly to the activity of these *guṇas*, which work for the interest of *purusas*. In the pre-evolutionary stage, the three *gunas* remain in a stage of equilibrium. Set to move by the inner unconscious teleology, they evolve the *mahat*, *ahamkara* and the rest; and it is their interaction that brings into existence, the diverse phenomena of the universe. The *gunas* are not only viewed as the ultimate stuff of the objective world, but they are also the ultimate psychical-stuff which lie at the root of all sorts of experience. *Sattva-guna* consists of goodness, *rajas* of passion and *tamas* of darkness or delusion. Goodness is of different variety, such as calmness, lightness, contentment, patience, happines, etc. Passion manifests itself as grief, distress, separation, excitement, attainment of what is evil, etc.

Darkness is of endless variety, such as covering, ignorance, disgust, misery, heaviness, sloth, drowsiness, intoxication, etc. These *guṇas* are repeatedly explained as substances in the classical *Sāṃkhya* (quality and substance being considered as inseparable).

The conception of the *guṇas* is very popular in Indian thought and Indian Philosophy. The world of experience is viewed everywhere to be under the influence and control of these *guṇas*.

Time:

Time as the principle of change and mutation is present in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (1.2). Things are born and exist in time and for that reason, time may be misrepresented by some as the cause of the world. But there are serious objections to it. The cognition of time depends upon the cognizing self and so time cannot be regarded as the ultimate cause. Time is also regarded

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

as a form of *Prajāpati*.(1) In the *Bṛhad Upaniṣad* too, time is held as a principle that causes changes in things. Its one form consists of days and nights, etc., and the other of lunar days. In order to attain liberation, one will have to transcend both the forms of time.(2) Thus, time is not looked upon as ultimate and final. It belongs to this empirical world. The Highest Reality is beyond time and space.

In the *Kapila-Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavat*, time is believed to exist as the instrumental cause of creation and dissolution of the world. Through the influence of *Kāla*, the equilibrium of the *guṇas* in Nature is disturbed, and the natural transformations of the well-known trinity take place. Time, therefore, is not a product of Nature. It is rather the transcendental effort of God by means of which the unmanifest Nature is transformed into this manifest world of colourful existence. Sometimes, *Kāla* (time) is also described as the external form of God, from which proceeds the activity of *Prakṛti*. He is the Respectful One Himself and *Kāla* too,—who by His own Divine active energy presides over the elements internally as *Puruṣa* and externally as Time.(3)

In the dialogue between *Asita Devala* and *Nārada*, in the epic, *Kāla* is spoken of as that, which being inpelled by *vhāva* brings into existence all things out of the five elements. It is the mutative principle under the influence of which, individuals are born in different bodies, exist in different bodies and die in order to be born again, in accordance with their accumulated merits and demerits Time is one of the eight eternal principles which constitute the source and merging place of all the *bhūtas* (elemental things).

The *Purānas* admit *Kāla* as the principle that brings about a synthesis between *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. The highest reality is God; and *vyakta*, *avyakta*, *puruṣa* and *kāla* are His four different forms. The function of *Kāla* is to associate *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* at the time of creation and also to dissociate them at the time of dissolution. It is beginningless and is the instrumental cause of all evolution and dissolution.

1. Praśna—1.9.
2. Brhad. Upaniṣad. 3. 1. 4. 5.
3. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa 3.26. 18. 19.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The theistic *Sāṃkhya* of *Kapila* believes in the eternal character of time. Time is regarded as real and trans-empirical. But for the classical *Saṃkhya*, this timeless time of trans-empirical character is wholly unreal. Time means limited time and it has no existence, separate from the atoms and their movements. In reality, *kāla* means nothing but the order in which the intellect cognizes its perceptions of ceaseless changes of atoms. So, the conception of time as an entity is simply a creation of our *buddhi*. In accordance with the changes of things, the *buddhi* measures it as past, present and future. The existence of any real time independent at *Prakrti* is not, therefore, admitted in the orthodox *Sāṃkhya* of the classical school.

Puruṣa:

In the *upaniṣads*, the word *puruṣa* is used primarily in the sense of the Supreme unchangeable reality, absolute, eternal, immortal and unconditional. It is conceived as the ultimate under-lying principle of the inner and outer worlds of change and variety. As essence of the external world, the *Purusa* is called the *Brahman*, and as the essence in man, it is known as the *atman*. The central principle of the upanisadic teaching is involved in the equation, *Brahma-Atman*. Both *Atman* and *Brahman* are implied when the term *Purusa* is used in the upanisads.

(iha eva antaḥsarire somya sa puruṣa yasmin etāḥ ṣoḍasākalāḥ probhavanti iti (1)

(Tam vedya puruṣa veda yathā bhāro mṛtyuḥ parivyathā (2) *tathā vidvān nāmarūpād-vimuktaḥ*

(parāt para puruṣamupati divyam)(3)

(Yathā paśyah pas yate rukmavarṇa kartāramīsam puruṣam brahmayonim(4)

(Divyohyamūrttaḥ puruṣaḥ sa vahyāvyantaro-hyajaḥ aprāṇo hi amanaḥ śubhro hyakṣarāt parataḥ paraḥ(5).

(Vedāhametam puruṣa mahāntamāditya varṇam tamasaḥ parastāt)(6)

(Puruṣāt na param kiñcit sā kaṣṭhā sā parā gatiḥ(7).

---

1. Praśna—7.2
2. Praṅśa-6.6
3. Muṇdaka Upa. 3.2.8.
4. Muṇdaka Upa. 3.1.3
5. Muṇdaka Upa. 2. 1. 2
6. Śvetāśvatara Upa. 3.8
7. Katha—Upa· 3. 11.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

From this *Puruṣa*, everything has come into existence and to it, all will return in the end. When this *puruṣa* is known, everything else is known. He is the active principle in the entire universe and yet the most passive and unmoved. "He creates all, smells all, wills all, tastes all, he has pervaded all, silent and unaffected."(1) "He is below, above, in the back, in front, in the south, and in the north, he is all this."(2) This *Puruṣa* is both immanent and transcendent. The *Brahman* is in the world and also outside of it. He is without beginning, infinite and the vast, yet the smallest of the small, omnipresent, without qualities, eternal, experiencer, not an agent in the worldly sense, knower of objects, and absolutely pure. He is existence, consciousness and bliss. Whoever realises this *Puruṣa*, enjoys pure bliss. All consciousness flows from Him, and He is the support of the entire universe.

The *Kapila Sāṃkhya* of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* also admits one *puruṣa* as the all pervading soul. He is the seer of all experiences, the eternal, and the ultimate principle that underlies all things of the universe. In this respect, therefore, the theistic *Sāṃkhya* of *Kapila* is in tune with the *Upaniṣads* which also admit one eternal and universal *puruṣa* as the basis of the world. But while theism, in its true sense, was never prominent in the *upaniṣads*, it is so in the *Bhāgavata Sāṃkhya* where the word *Puruṣa* is used more in the sense of a personal God (who is an appropriate object of devotion and worship) than in the sense of an impersonal indeterminate *Brahman* or *Ātman*.

In the epic, the word *Puruṣa* is used to signify both the individual *Puruṣa* and the highest spiritual reality.(3)

In the *Gītā*, on the other hand, the word *puruṣa* is used in four different senses :—

(a) It is used in the sense of God or the all-inclusive personality of Lord Kriṣṇa.(4)

(b) It is used in the sense of ordinary human beings.(5)

1. Chānd. III 14.1
2. Chānd. Upa. VII 25.1.
3. The Mahabhārata, Śānti Parvan—350, 351.
4. The Gītā XI. 18. 38.
5. Ibid—II—12, 21, 60, etc.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

(c) The word is also used in the sense of *Kṣara puruṣa*; and

(d) *Akṣara-puruṣa.*—While the *Kṣara puruṣa* refers to all living beings, the *akṣara puruṣa* refers to the unchangeable spiritual principle that manifests itself in so many conglomerations as their indwelling souls or *kṣetrajñas.*

The *Purāṇas*, generally, admit *puruṣa* as a form or manifestation of *Vasudeva* or *Maheśvara.* It is not, therefore, the ultimate basis of the world. It is only one of the three categories (the other two beings *kāla* and *Prakṛti*) that create this psycho-physical universe through the will of God.

The *Ahirbudhnya-Samhitā* uses the word *Puruṣa* in a peculiar sense. *Puruṣa*, here, means a collection of selves, like cells in a honey-comb. These selves, being special manifestations of God, are in themselves pure and omniscient. But as they are associated with beginningless ignorance, their infinite knowledge shrinks considerably and they also become impure (being touched by afflictions of different kinds). The *puruṣa*, therefore, is partly pure and partly impure. It is a non-transformable principle, although its presence is necessary for creating an occasion for the transformation of *Prakṛti.* The word here does not stand for a single *ātman*; but it represents a stage in which the selves remain in collection, through the desire of God.

The *Caraka Samhitā* uses the word *Puruṣa* to mean both the forms of the Self, i.e., the empirical and the transcendental. In its empirical form, the self is called the *rāśi-puruṣa*, while in the transcendental form, it is described as the uncaused, beginningless and eternal *puruṣa. Puruṣa*, in its empirical appearance, becomes the upholder of consciousness and the experiencer of all pleasures and pains. But in its pure form, it is devoid of all qualities (including consciousness), indeterminate and unmanifested.

The soul in the classical *Sāṃkhya* is described as being devoid of all other characteristics, except pure consciousness. Its nature is absolute pure consciousness and it is not one, but many. All the transcendental *puruṣas* are real and inactive, although due to illusion, they appear as enjoyers of various experiences. The

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

special characteristic of the self is that it is the basic epistemological principle without which knowledge would be impossible. The *buddhi*, the main organ of knowledge, is unconscious in its nature. It becomes enlightened only with the reflected light of the *Puruṣa*. The *Puruṣa*, in reality, is indifferent to all the works of Nature; yet, because of the co-mingling of the reflection of the external object on *buddhi* with the reflection of its own light, the *puruṣa* mistakenly ascribes to itself the act of experiencing the external object which, in fact, belongs to *buddhi*. Form and motion are the characteristics of Nature, while pure consciousness is the characteristic of the soul. Each *puruṣa* is eternal, immortal, unconditioned and absolute. There is a separate *puruṣa* for each individual, according to the classical Sāṃkhya; and in this respect it differs radically from the *vedānta* idealism which recognizes the reality of one *Ātman* only. The original theistic *Sāṃkhya* of *Kapila* (as depicted in the *Bhāgavata*) was more in agreement with the *vedānta* on this point, since finite selves were regarded there as countless images of one *Puruṣa*. The recognition of the plurality of transcendental *puruṣas* in a regular system of thought is mainly a contribution to the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy by the classical school. While the theistic *Sāṃkhya* of Kapila holds that the innumerable *puruṣas* are manifestations of the same ultimate reality, the classical *Samkhya* declares emphatically that the real transcendental *puruṣas* are many in number.

Printed by M. R. Nagar at the Pioneer Press, Lucknow—28.

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

The EVOLUTION of the SAMKHYA SCHOOL of THOUGHT

— is a comprehensive original study of the exposition of the evolution of the Samkhya School of thought. For the first time the authoress has traced and connected details of the Samkhya thought which contributed finally to the present system of Samkhya philosophy.

The book is thoroughly documented and contains valuable information hitherto only obtainable by reference to various Sanskrit sources.

No one engaged in the study of Indian Philosophy can fail to obtain material help from this valuable publication.

The simplicity of expression and clarity of thought is commendable.

Stockists

UNIVERSAL BOOK STALL
THE MALL · KANPUR · U. P.

* * * *

PUSTAK MAHAL
CHAUHATTA · PATNA · BIHAR

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi

Digitization by eGangotri and Sarayu Trust. Funding by MoE-IKS

About this Book . .

This book contains a detailed exposition of the Samkhya School of Thought which is one of the oldest philosophical doctrines of India. This school owes its origin to the dualistic teachings of the Upanishads and passing through various stages (both theistic and atheistic) has assumed a classical form. All thes stages have been fully expounded in thi original work and an intelligent attemp has also been made to ground them on textual evidence.

Perhaps, this is the first time that an attempt has been made in English to trace and connect in detail, the different lines of Samkhya thought which contributed finally to the present system of the Samkhya Philosophy.

In producing this work, the authoress has given a correct exposition of the different schools on the basis of a first hand and direct study of the sources in original.

The main work was a thesis submitted by the authoress to the Lucknow University for which she was awarded Ph. D. Degree. The thesis was examined by Dr. S. Radha Krishnan and Dr. Satkari Mukherjee, Director, Pali Research Institute, Nalanda. The work was highly appreciated by them.

. . EDITOR

COVER PRINTING by
AJANTA PRESS, KANPUR

CC0. In Public Domain. Sri Sri Anandamayee Ashram Collection, Varanasi